MILTON B. PFEFFER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ONE EAST 57TH STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
—
212 MURRAY HILL 8-8880

March 27, 1973

Dear Roger:

Enclosed are copies of the three papers I put together concerning the 1794, 1795 and 1797 holy cow emission sequences. I have also sent copies to Dr Zopp, for PW.

Sincerely
Milt

Yes
Unlikely
Alert

THE 1794 HALF CENT EMISSION SEQUENCE

By Milton B. Pfeffer

The 1794 half cents were struck from five obverse dies and five reverse dies combining to form nine varieties. The early students of these coins -- Dr. Edward Maris (1870), Mr. Edouard Frossard (1879), Mr. Charles Steigerwalt (1908) and Mr. Ebenezer Gilbert (1916) -- described the dies, but did not try to find the order of their use. To my knowledge, only two persons have published emission sequences, namely, George R. Ross in 1915 (1) and Roger Cohen, Jr. in 1971 (2). In addition, Walter Breen in all likelihood long ago formulated a die use progression for the entire half cent series, which has yet to be published.

On examining the 1794 obverses, Dr. Maris noted that in one of them the tail of the 9 (in the date) was sharp, rather than knobbed (3). This occurred only in obverse 1, using Cohen's die designation. (I shall continue to use Cohen's designation, for convenience.) The sharp-tailed 9 was used for all the 1793 half cent varieties, and the 1792 pattern coins.

In addition to that, Ross observed that obverse 1 was similar to the 1793 varieties (and different from the other 1794 varieties) in that the lower line of the bust was without a loop below the shoulder.

Because of its design similarities to the 1793 half cents, Ross placed obverse 1 and its reverse A (which was not used with any other obverse) at the head of the 1794 sequence. I agree that this marriage of dies undoubtedly has the strongest claim to the first position.

After this placement, it is necessary to rely upon die deterioration, more than anything else, to work out the die use progression for this year.

We start with the 3-D and 3-E pairings, which establish a short sequence. A small break in obverse 3 of 3-D is found to be extended in 3-E. Neither of the two reverses exhibits a break. Beyond question, then, 3-D was at work in the press before 3-E.

Moreover, since reverses D and E in those matings are unbroken, it follows that if they are cracked in combination with any other obverse, those damaged combinations had to follow 3-E. On examining the 5-D and 5-E combinations, both reverses are found to be broken, requiring their placement after 3-E. I would put 5-D ahead of 5-E, not on die break evidence, but rather because reverse D appeared before reverse E in their earlier marriages with obverse 3.

Turning to the 3-C combination, we see that both dies are unbroken; and it therefore takes its place ahead of 3-D, where obverse 3 first exhibits a break.

The next die marriage that falls into place is 5-B. Whereas obverse 5 in its earlier use remained unbroken, in 5-B it starts to break. Therefore, it must follow 5-E. In addition, 5-B provides an important clue, since reverse B is also broken. This implies that if reverse B is found unbroken in any pairing of dies, that combination was striking coins before 5-B. This is exactly what we see in 2-B. Both dies are perfectly sound in that marriage, so 2-B must fit in somewhere before 5-B and after 1-A. (2-B and 5-B are important combinations: they each produced R2 coins, the most numerous of the 179~~7~~'s.)

It is tempting to place 2-B just ahead of 5-B, thereby forming a two-coin series of reverse B dies. But that would break up the three-coin obverse 5 series. In the same way, putting 2-B among the obverse 3 coins would also interrupt a three-coin grouping. I therefore have placed it before 3-C, thus allowing the continuous use of the obverse 3 dies followed by the obverse 5 dies.

One can imagine the mint personnel, finding 5-B broken (both obverse and reverse), looking about for a new pair of dies. At this point, the only ones left were obverses 1, 2 and 4 and reverses A and C. Of these, 1 and 2 had clash marks and A was rather shallow. On the other hand C was a good, sound die; and 4, while bulging a bit at an edge, was new and completely serviceable. It would therefore make sense to end the series with the 4-C marriage of dies.

My tentative sequence, compared with those proposed by Ross and Cohen, is, as follows:

I	MINE	1/A	2/B	3/C-D-E	5/D-E-B	4/C
II	ROSS	1/A	2/B	3/D-E-C	4/C	5/E-D-B
III	COHEN (press no.1)	1/A	2/B	3/C-D-E	5/E-D-B	
	(press no.2)			4/C		

There are very few clues left. The frequently blackish looking 179~~7~~ half cent, compared with 1795 (4), is too generalized to allow for differentiation of varieties. So, too, planchet weight and thickness are not significantly different.

That leaves only the edge device variations. Dr. Maris mentions (3) that the 1-A die combination has large edge letters unlike all the other varieties. However, we now know that a few specimens of 1-A have small edge letters; and, also, that a similar differentiation exists in the 2-B marriage, where the small

edge letters are common and the large uncommon.

This seems to indicate a progression: large lettered edges to small lettered edges. It seems reasonable to suppose that all the coins having one edge style were struck at one time. It would have been a waste of effort to change edge dies for no reason; and if two milling machines were available for half cents, all the half cent varieties would be found with both edge letters. It is more likely that this 1794 coinage started with the large letter edge dies, which broke early in their use, and thereafter continued with new edge dies that had small letters.

If this is correct, the sequence must be altered to show the two large lettered edges (G-9 and CMM 2b) ahead of the remaining varieties, thus:

1-A	(G-9, CMM 1a)
2-B	(CMM 2b)
1-A	(CMM 1b)
2-B	(G-5, CMM 2a)
3-C	(G-7, CMM 3)
3-D	(G-8, CMM 5)
3-E	(G-6, CMM 6)
5-D	(G-3, CMM 8)
5-E	(G-2, CMM 7)
5-B	(G-1, CMM 9)
4-C	(G-4, CMM 4)

It is necessary to add, or should I say "admit," that some preference is nearly always present in the formulation of die use progressions. A critical observer, scanning the sequences proposed by Ross, Cohen or myself, sees rather quickly that they are <u>obverse oriented</u>. They show a preference to use one obverse die either with one reverse die or, uninterruptedly, with a number of reverse dies. In other words, the formulator does not believe that an obverse die is used for a while, lain aside while other obverses are used, and then put back into the press.

One can formulate a perfectly logical progression of die use based on the opposite assumption, that is, a <u>reverse-orientation</u>, where one reverse die is used with only one obverse or, uninterruptedly, with a number of different obverses. Then, employing the same logic derived from die deterioration and design similarities, the following progression is found:

$$\frac{1}{A} \quad \frac{3-4}{C} \quad \frac{3-5}{D} \quad \frac{3-5}{E} \quad \frac{2-5}{B}$$

Compare this with the obverse-oriented sequence, which is:

1/A	2/B	3/C-D-E	5/D-E-B	4/C

There is no logical reason to prefer one over the other. Each merely represents one solution to an intellectual puzzle.

Were any of the 1794 half cents struck in 1795? The mint used other 1794 dies in 1795. Taxay, for example, points out (5) that all the 1794 half dimes and 75 per cent of the 1794 half dollars were struck in 1795.

I do not believe that the same sort of thing happened with the 1794 half cents. At that time the mint had at least two, and possibly three, coinage presses, and it concentrated on copper coinage, which started early in 1793. Silver coinage began late in 1794 and gold coinage did not start until 1795. It is reasonably clear, therefore, that the mint had enough time and equipment in 1794 to strike its half cents bearing the 1794 date.

A word should be said about the speculative 3-A die marriage. No specimen is known, at present. Mr. Gilbert (6) in 1916 said that Dr. Maris (3) in 1870 described one variety that would correspond to the G-6 obverse and G-9 reverse (or, in other words, die combination 3-A). From my own reading of Dr. Maris' description of the 1794 half cents, I cannot agree. His descriptions in this instance are not that precise, and of course there were no photographs. But if Mr. Gilbert is correct, somewhere "out there" is a variety (like Sleeping Beauty) awaiting rediscovery. It must also await sequence placement, for without die state information, we cannot get very far.

Footnotes

(1) George R. Ross, "The Half Cent Varieties of 1794," The Numismatist, October, 1915, Volume 28, page 354.

(2) Roger Cohen, Jr., "American Half Cents," 1971.

(3) Dr. Edward Maris, "Varieties of the Copper Issues of the United States' Mint in the year 1794," second edition, 1970.

(4) Q. David Bowers, "Numismatic Depth Study," Coin World, October 25, 1972.

(5) Don Taxay, "Comprehensive Catalogue and Encyclopedia of United States Coins," 1970.

(6) Ebenezer Gilbert, "The United States Half Cents," 1916.

THE 1795 HALF CENT EMISSION SEQUENCE

By Milton B. Pfeffer

The half cent varieties of this year were struck from three obverse and four reverse dies. The effort to discover their order of use is aided, first, by the fact that on December 27, 1795 the weight of the half cent planchet was changed, by Pres. Washington's order, from 104 grains to 84 grains (1). One may therefore presume that the heavy coins of 1795 were struck before that date, and the light ones after.

This assumption is supported by economic, not merely legal, considerations. The change in weight was ordered because copper was in short supply and its price was rising. It is not likely that the mint officials would continue to strike the heavy planchet coins at a cost that threatened to exceed the face value of the half cent.

Among the heavy planchet coins, some varieties are of the official weight of 104 grains, and others weigh 115 grains (more or less). An initial differentiation occurs, therefore; and using the die designations employed by Roger Cohen, Jr. (2), the heavy planchet die marriages divide themselves, as follows: 1-A and 2-A(104 gr.); 3-C and 3-D(115 gr.).

George R. Ross in 1915, despite a number of inaccurate die descriptions, set forth an emission sequence based upon a progression from heavy planchet coins to light ones (3). But he was not aware of all the varieties.

Secondly, the progression of die uses in 1795 may also be determined, in part, from differences in planchet sources. For example, the standard (heavy) weight coins of 104 grains struck from the 1-A and 2-A matings appear to come from the mint's own sheet copper planchets, like the 1794 half cents. This similarity, both in weight and planchet source, suggests that 1-A and 1-B should start the sequence for 1795, followed by the only remaining heavy planchet varieties, those struck from 3-C and 3-D. These last two varieties both seem to have been struck on rejected large cents, rolled down and cut down for (the less important) half cents.

Another reason for locating these 3-C and 3-D varieties right after 1-A and 1-B is that obverse 3 is the same die as obverse 1, except that it has been reground to remove surface imperfections. The liberty pole was removed along with the imperfections.

Thirdly, edge lettering provides another clue to the order of die use. All the 1793 and 1794 varieties have edge lettering. Of the 1795 varieties, only the heavy planchet 1-A and 2-A strikes have edge lettering. This confirms the hunch that the 1-A and 2-A heavy coins should lead off the sequence. They are more akin to the 1794's in weight, planchet source, and edge device than any of the other 1795's.

I am ignoring the unique specimen of a lettered edge strike (1-A) on a thin planchet, formerly in the Brobston collection. This seems to be a mere transitional error or experiment, and not a regular emission. The same thing occurred among the large cents of this year, that is, S-76b. Dr. Sheldon noted in Penny Whimsy that "apparently the change to the thin planchets preceded the abandonment of the edge lettering, as a few examples [of S-76b] are found with a comparatively thin planchet and lettered edge."

Starting with 1-A and 2-A in the heavy planchet group, I put 1-A at the head, because Mr. Gilbert (4) reports that the obverse "sometimes shows a die break" (before the date). This indicates that it started to break during use. However, its reverse did not deteriorate in the 1-A pairing. Warping started in the 2-A combination. Hence, 1-A demands priority over 2-A.

3-C and 3-D are next, and between the two, 3-C comes first, because a crack appeared on the reverse of that mating, causing it to be lain aside and reverse D put in the press with obverse 3.

The sequence for the four heavy planchet varieties is, therefore, 1-A, 2-A, 3-C and 3-D.

This leaves the light planchet varieties struck from the 2-A, 2-B, 2-C, 3-C and 3-D die marriages. An easy start is with 2-C and 3-C, where the reverse die deterioration point to a progression from 2-C to 3-C.

In studying obverse 2 in the 2-C pairing, we find that it began to develop a bulge at the border opposite the face of Miss Liberty. This tells us that other obverse 2 pairings where the obverse is without the bulge preceded 2-C. For this reason, I have placed 2-B and 2-A ahead of 2-C.

2-B is given priority over 2-A because reverse B is a new die and might have been preferred over reverse A at that point, especially since reverse A had already been put to much use in the heavy planchet series, producing G-1, CMM-1 (an R2 strike) and G-3, CMM-2a (an R3 strike), and exhibited some warping as a result of its labors. Reverse B is finally replaced by reverse A after B exhibits a bulge that is worse than A's. However, the new 2-A combination is sparingly used, probably because both dies are bulged.

The light planchet sequence, so far, is 2-B, 2-A, 2-C and 3-C, leaving only 3-D to be placed. This is not difficult. The break in the reverse die of 3-C gets worse, and calls for replacement. Reverse D is at hand, perfectly sound, and is put to work with obverse 3 to finish off the series.

My proposed order of use meets its most severe test in the varieties produced from the three die marriages that were used both for the heavy and light planchets: 2-A, 3-C and 3-D. Observeable deterioration of the dies would have to proceed from the thick planchet variety to the light.

2-A: The heavy planchet variety is G-3, CMM-2a, and is known as the lettered edge, punctuated date. Cohen reports no die breaks, and adds that some warping on the reverse is erroneously called a die break. Gilbert, for example, does this (4). Similarly, Bowers and Ruddy find no breaks (5). The light planchet variety is the plain edge, punctuated date, G-8, CMM-2b. Its condition is reported similarly -- no breaks, reverse warping. These findings are not inconsistent with the earlier striking of the heavy planchet variety, and the later striking of the light planchet variety.

3-D: The heavy planchet variety, not known to Mr. Gilbert, is CMM-6b. Cohen, who discovered it, does not know of any die breaks. The same is true of the light planchet variety G-5, CMM-6a. No breaks are reported by any of the commentators. Again, these findings are not inconsistent with the earlier striking of the heavy planchet variety.

3-C: The heavy planchet variety is G-6, CMM-5b and is known as the plain edge, no pole. The light planchet variety is G-6, CMM-5a. For both varieties, the only available comment is that the reverse break is more extensive than found in 2-C, which is G-4, CMM-4, the plain edge with pole, punctuated date. However, none of the commentators has published an analysis of reverse C, specifically detailing the appearance and extension of the break, comparing the thick planchet die state with the light planchet die state; and then comparing them both with G-4, CMM-4.

If I am right, the least deterioration should appear on the heavy planchet variety, G-6, CMM-5b. The break will be somewhat advanced on the thin planchet G-4, CMM-4, and still more advanced on the thin planchet G-6, CMM-5a. Until reliable comparisons are made on accurate data, my emission sequence has to be regarded as conjectural. So is mine

An interesting parallel exists in the 1795 large cents. The last lettered edge variety that was struck before the change in planchet weight is S-76a, which Dr. Sheldon says is not found with any die breaks (6). The same dies were also used to strike the lighter, plain edge variety, S-76b, and here the dies are found both perfect and (later) with an obverse break and reverse crumbling. This proves the die use progression from heavy planchet to light planchet cents.

The complete sequence for 1795 is therefore, as follows:

Coinage before December 27, 1795 (heavy planchets):

1-A, 2-A, 3-C, 3-D

Coinage after December 27, 1795 (light planchets):

2-A, 2-B, 2-C, 3-C, 3-D

The final question for consideration is the period of time when the 1795's were struck. Since the coinage of the heavy planchet varieties ended on December 27, 1795, and the mint personnel were hard at work striking a vast number of the new, light weight large cents during the last days of 1795 and the first quarter of 1796 (7), it is a practical certainty that the striking of 1795-dated half cents continued well into 1796. Confirmation of this is found in the fact that the mint delivering of half cents in 1795 amounted to only 25,600, compared with 31,600 in 1794 and 35,334 in 1793. To my mind, this shows that the mint held back production in 1795 waiting for the official change of weight, and when that went into effect, it pulled out all the stops and struck 137,950 half cents up to April 19, 1796. These were most certainly from dies dated 1795. Perhaps even more of 1796 coinage carried a 1795 date.

In the emission sequence here proposed, the light planchet 3-D variety was the last struck. This is the coin that very often is found struck on a rolled-down and clipped Talbot, Allum & Lee token. Is that consistent with the time when the mint got these tokens?

This, also, is not free from doubt. Some say that the mint bought 1,076 pounds (or 32,000) of the tokens in early 1796 (8). Others say the tokens were received a year earlier, on April 23, 1795 (9). Even if the 1795 date proves to be correct, this would not preclude the 1796 use of the tokens, since the evidence is overwhelming that the mint did not start coining the light planchet varieties until after December 27, 1795.

The 3-D light planchet variety is considered an R2 coin, that is, there are believed to be about 1,250 known survivors. Using the 3% rule-of-thumb, this would indicate a coinage of 41,666. The deliveries of half cents in March, 1796 were 47,000, which is fairly close for mere rule-of-thumb reasoning, and thereby provides further corroboration of the 3-D light planchet placement.

STEWART

Footnotes

(1) Presidential Proclamation of January 26, 1796, pursuant to the Act of Congress of March 3, 1795.

(2) Roger Cohen, Jr., American Half Cents, 1971.

(3) George R. Ross, "The Half Cent Varieties of 1795," The Numismatist, November, 1915, Volume 28, page 394.

(4) Ebenezer Gilbert, "The United States Half Cents," 1916.

(5) Bowers, Q. David and Ruddy, James F., "United States Half Cents 1793-1857," 1962.

(6) William H. Sheldon, "Penny Whimsy," 1958 Edition, page 145.

(7) William H. Sheldon, op. cit., page 151.

(8) Walter Breen, "The 1856 Flying Eagle Cent," Rare Coin Review, June-July, 1971; Lester Merkin Catalogue, March 28-29, 1969.

(9) Don Taxay, "The U.S. Mint and Coinage," 1966, page 123; R.W. Julian, "The Copper Coinage of 1795," Numismatic Scrapbook, December, 1964. Cf., Cohen, op. cit., page 17.

THE 1797 HALF CENT EMISSION SEQUENCE

By Milton B. Pfeffer

I shall continue to use Roger Cohen's die designations for this year (1).

Only three obverse and two reverse dies were used. The principal area of uncertainty is placing the 3-B die marriage.

The 1-A to 2-A progression is crystal clear. In 1-A, the obverse becomes utterly shattered. It is removed from the press and replaced by obverse 2, which continues striking coins in combination with Reverse A, a die that remains quite serviceable despite a faint break that started late in the 1-A pairing. The break worsens during the 2-A strikings, but the die never becomes unfit for use, by 1797 standards.

This brings us to the 3-B combination. The issue of that marriage of dies are three in number: The lettered edge variety, the plain edge variety and the gripped edge variety. A sequence is apparent among the siblings of the 3-B family. The break that occasionally appears in the obverse of the lettered edge variety is found extended in the plain edge variety (from chin to right milling), proving its prior use. I cannot place the gripped edge variety because I do not have an accurate description of the die break exhibited by it, based specifically on a comparison with the other two varieties.

When the dies do not speak for themselves, we must look elsewhere. Walter Breen writes that the gripped edge half cents "are known to have been made between the lettered edge and plain edge coins of Feb. - Mar. 1797" (2). Breen apparently feels that the lettered edge variety was the first half cent struck in 1797, since it is described in a New Netherlands catalogue as "Breen 22a: 1-A" (3).

Don Taxay (4), on the other hand, says that the lettered edge variety was struck in 1799. Roger Cohen, Jr. (5) says that some of the 1-A and 2-A coins were struck in 1799, and he implies that the 3-B coins (low head varieties) are 1800 strikes. He mentions that one of the 3-B coins is known to be overstruck on a planchet derived from a 1798 large cent, and his emission sequence for 1797 is 1-A, 2-A, 3-B (plain edge, lettered edge, gripped edge).

Are there any other clues to the order of die use?

An analysis of the 1797 half cents in terms of planchet source is of some help in finding a sequence, bearing in mind that 1796 half cents were struck on cut down, rejected large cents.

large cent planchets	3-B, lettered edge
large cent planchets	3-B, gripped edge
large cent planchets and T.A.L. tokens	3-B, plain edge
T.A.L. tokens and sheet copper planchets	1-A
T.A.L. tokens and sheet copper planchets	2-A

This would indicate (roughly, I grant) a progression:

3-B (LE, GE, PE); 1-A; 2-A

An examination of the 1797 large cents also suggests that the 3-B varieties were struck near the beginning of the year. In 1797 the mint produced a large cent, gripped edge coin, as well as a half cent gripped edge. May we not assume that both were produced at about the same time, when the machinery was at hand, and thoughts were directed to that type of edge? Dr. Sheldon notes (6) that of the many die combinations that struck the 1797 large cents, only two (2-A and 3-A) produced the gripped edge varieties (S-120b and S-121), and he places them third and fourth among the thirty one varieties for that year. Logically, the half cent gripped edge variety should also have a place at the beginning of the sequence, not at the end.

There is yet another reason for ending with 2-A. It will be recalled that obverse 1 shattered badly, obverse 3 gradually developed a break, but obverse 2 remained unbroken and sound. If the 3-B pairing is placed last, one would have to believe that the mint officials continued to use obverse 3 after it exhibited a break in an important area (from the chin of Miss Liberty to the right edge of the coin); and that they did this although the perfectly sound obverse 2 was at hand, which had the additional advantage of being able to strike a better looking coin than the "low head," obverse 3. Does it not seem more likely that obverses 1 and 3 had already been in the press and were no longer serviceable, so that obverse 2 was the only die left (with reverse A) to strike the remaining half cents of this year?

Were any of the 1797 dies used in 1799 or 1800? As noted earlier, Taxay believes that the lettered edge variety was struck in 1799, whereas Cohen suggests that it was struck in 1800 and some of the other varieties were struck in 1799. The evidence to support these proposals is: (1) the mint delivery of 12,170 half cents in 1799; (2) the mint delivery of 8,622 half cents in early 1800; and (3) the finding of a 3-B half cent overstruck on a 1798 cut down, large cent. No! 1797

My own view is that the 1799 deliveries represent previously struck but undelivered 1797's, rather than half cents struck in 1799 from the dies of 1797; and that the 1800 deliveries were of half cents struck in early 1800, before the mint received the Boulton and Watt planchets from England.

The large cents do not shed any light on this problem. They show two, contradictory policies: (1) a refusal to use certain dies bearing the date of an earlier year, and, instead, overdating the final digit to show the true year of striking (S-150, S-151, S-152, 1799 NC-1, S-188); (2) and, simultaneously with that, a use of "last year's" dies, without any overdating (S-171, and S-186, for example).

This means we cannot take it for granted that the 1797 obverse half cent would have been overdated to 1799 (or 1800) if used in the later year.

Apart from the reasons I have already advanced in favor of the view that the 3-B varieties were struck before 1-A and 2-A, there are certain esthetic features that set apart the 1797's from 1800, and create a wide gulf between them, making it hard to believe that there was an 1800 (or 1799) use of the dies of 1797.

The year 1800 produced a new type of half cent -- the Draped Bust. The new portrait, which had been used for the 1796 large cents, was designed by Gilbert Stuart, then the nation's leading portrait painter and an artist highly regarded by his contemporaries. At last, professionalism had taken hold at the mint. The "new breed" must have looked down their noses at the home-made appearance of the crude dies produced by the clumsy, unschooled apprentices who staffed the mint in its early years.

These professionals saw no charm in the Liberty Caps, only a want of skill, and their feelings of superior craftsmanship would not have tolerated the use in 1800, or 1799, of the 1797's with their flaws, blemishes and irregularities.

Consider the 3-B dies, for example. The head is far too low in the field. The numerals 1 and 9 (in the date) are graceless, and the 7's are a shade different from one another. The coins made from these dies were struck off center, or weakly on the right side, or on undersized, poor quality planchets. In the 1-A die combination, the obverse is the well known 1 over 1, where the engraver cut the 1 too high, realized his error, ignored it, and then proceeded to cut another 1 beneath the first 1, followed by the other date numerals. The reverse of this marriage is also flawed. Obverse 2 is about the best of the obverses, but the long, thin dentils give it an odd look, especially since the coin is often struck somewhat off center and on a poor planchet.

Surely, the men who struck the sleek 1800 half cents had become too uppity to traffic with the lowly 1797's, poor relations from earlier days. These men truly overcame great obstacles and raised themselves by their own bootstraps. They must have felt it beneath them to use the crude dies of 1797 to strike a mere 8,622 half cents in early 1800, or even 12,170 in 1799. In 1800, they really showed everyone what they could do: they struck over 200,000 half cents from a single pair of dies that remained unbroken to the very end! What did they need the 1797's for?

My hunch, therefore, is that all the 1797's were actually struck in 1797 from dies made in that year, or in 1796. As for the 1797 3-B specimen found overstruck on a cut down, 1798 large cent (7), that may represent nothing more than an irregularity or experiment by a mint workman, and not an authorized emission.

I, therefore, cast my vote in favor of the following sequence: 3-B lettered edge; 3-B gripped edge; 3-B plain edge; 1-A and 2-A.

Footnotes

(1) Roger Cohen, Jr., American Half Cents, 1971.

(2) Walter Breen, "The 1797 NC-7 -- A New, Unlisted Variety," Penny Wise, Vol. II, p. 218.

(3) New Netherlands 56th Sale, June, 1962.

(4) Don Taxay, "1971 Encyclopedia of U.S. Coins," 1970, page 65

(5) Cohen, ibid., page 24.

(6) William H. Sheldon, "Penny Whimsy," 1958, page 184, 186.

(7) Cohen, ibid, page 24.

4-30-73

These comments came today from Walter Breen.
I thought you would be interested

Walter Hoffman

BULLSHIT

Box 352, Berkeley, CA 94701

Dear Minlton---

Thank you for the emission sequences on 1794-5-7. I hope they are not going 'as is' to PW, or some people are going to jump on you.

The 1794 sequence is ultimately governed by these variables:
(1) Large edge lettering presumably preceded small.
(2) The poninted 9 punch, found only on G-9, more resembles that of 1793 than it does any later punch; hence the G-9 die may have been made earlier than the rest, even aside from its different style which suggests it being at one end of a sequence.
(3) Die breaks do enable us to decide which groups came before which.
(4) The obverses of Gilbert 4, 5=8=7=6 are from the same hub though drastically modified. The obverse of the "high relief" or "shielded hair" die, Gilbert 2=3=1, is probably from the same hub but again drastically modified.

Put these all together and we get the order I arrived at in 1956:
Gilbert 9a & 9b (large and small edge letters)
5a & 5b (ditto)
8, 6, 7 A small rim break over BER develops in size
4 Obviously followed G-7. The dies heavily clashed too.
2, 3, 1 Rev. of G-2 followed its use in G-6 from die breaks
Rev. of G-3 obviously later than its use in G-8
Rev. of G-1 obviously later than its use in G-5

BAEEN "GOD"
1
2
5
6
3
4
9
8
7

Thus your work here is reasonable enough, though I suspect I've had access to a few more broken-die coins than you over the years.

Now to the 1795. Hold on to your dentures.
The 115-grain extra-heavies are NOT struck on the old 104-grain standard, but rather they were struck in 1796 and later on blanks cut down from spoiled cents (mostly off center cents). Evidence of this is in the CENT BOOK kept by Henry Voigt and later Adam Eckfeldt, now preserved in the Archives.
This leaves us with the following criteria:
(1) Lettered edge coins, struck generally on 104-grain blanks (deviants may have been struck on blanks cut down from something else), were the coins made between October 8 and Dec. 1, 1795; in all 25,600.
(2) Plain edge coins, struck generally on 84-grain blanks (aside from the extra-heavies already accounted for), obviously formed the deliveries of Dec. 28-31, 1795 and through the spring of 1796. In all 109,000.
(3) Obv. of Gilbert 1 was drastically reground, removing the pole, to make that of G-5=6, thus these last were obviously much later.
1=3=8 (4) Rev. of Gilbert shows a heavier rim break and a heavier failure at MER on 8 than on 3, on 3 than on 1. (The rim break is narrow and not always visible; look above ER ER ED.)
(5) The break in upper wreath is much heavier on G-6 than on G-4, thus the G-6 was obviously later.
(6) There is a progressive failure in central obv. on G-8=7=4, establishing the order of these three varieties.

Put them all together and you get:
(Fall 1795) G-1, then G-3
Dies of G-3 remained in the press until after Christmas. Then:

(Late Dec. 1795 through spring 1796: 109,000 in all)

G-8 Reverse failure advanced.

G-7 Reverse failed quickly.

G-4 Reverse failed quickly, but for some reason obv. failed even more drastically. Reverse kept in press, obv. discarded, old obv. of G-1=3=8 (by now rusted) reground drastically to remove rust, some of which remains visible in hair, and put into press. Followed:

G-6 Thin and some thick specimens. Rev. gave way completely.

G-5 Thin and some thick specimens.

In June 1796, the new obverses were put into use, possibly at first to strike specimens for some celebration having to do with the admission of Tennessee to the Union, as the eagles dated 1796--and probably the very first presentation quarter eagles, quarter dollars, and 16-star halves--also date from this time. We then get G-1 and 2 of 1796, in that order. It is gratuitous confirmation that the rev of 1796 is more similar to that of 1795 G-5 than to any other die.

Now to the 1797. We are obviously on very unsafe ground, and I am at present convinced that many of the broken-die coins both of the Low Head and 1 over 1 dies were made in 1799, some of the former with lettered edges. Incidentally, here as in 1795 it is NOT safe yo use a 3% rule of thumb; the 3% characteristic ratio or survival ratio was originally established for 1794 cents, and has had to be tentatively re-evaluated for cents of other dates, as for other denominations.

The following criteria are relevant:

(1) The Low Head die was made before the rest; its pointed 9 punch occurs also on the 1797 dime with 16 stars, the knobbed 9 punch on the 1797 dime with 13 stars, and the 16-star coin is known to have come earlier.

(2) A die may or may not have been used immediately after manufacture; it may have been used briefly and laid aside, or revived after others had been discarded.

(3) There may have been more than one episode of use of cents cut down, and/or of TA&L tokens; in fact, there were several recorded instances of use of spoiled cents, as late as 1802. Use of spoiled cents therefore is not a evidence of order of emission, except that no half cents were struck in 1798, and any overstruck on 1798 cents must have been included among the 12,167 struck in 1799 from 1797 dies.

(4) More than one variety may have been made in 1799.

(5) The reverse break appears on some but not all G-3's and some but not all G-4's, though it is found (so far as I know) plainly on all the shattered-obverse G-4's. Some of the latter have been found on TA&L tokens, some on blanks made from sheet copper, some reportedly on cent blanks (not confirmed). Evidently the G-4 & 3 alternated.

(6) The obverse break is found on Low Head coins from all three subvarieties--lettered, gripped and plain, though it is strongest on some plain edge coins, stronger even than on the lettered edge coins overstruck on 1798 cents! Most of these have undexchipherable undertypes.

(7) The reverse break began after the obv. break had well advanced, and it is found on both lettered (late) and plain edge coins. It follows that:

(8) Edge lettering was done on more than one occasion!

(9) Edge gripping was done at the mint. I have seen more than one gripped-edge 1797 (moderately advanced breaks) with undecipherable cent undertypes.

(10) The smallest half-cents of 1797 (planchet diameter, not weight) are the earlier Low Head coins. Apparently more than one blank cutter was in use, the broader one possibly the same earlier used for half eagles. This suggests, but does not confirm, that the smaller coins

came first, and/or that the use of extra broad flans on the G-3 coins and some G-4's may may have been an afterthought, possibly dictated by poorer striking quality of the narrower thicker ones (even as in 1795).

Put all this together and you get a Mischmash, but at least the following is possible:

1797 Strikings
G-1=2. Lettered, gripped and plain edges. Early breaks.
G-3 and early 4. The die break on rev. probably occurred here.

1799 Strikings
G-1 & 2. Overstrikes on cents including some dated 1798. Heavy breaks
G-4 shattered die; G-3 late breaks.
Order between these two groups undeterminable, though the G-3 mam obv. die appears to have outlinved everything else and may have been used on the last of the 1799 strikings, with fairly heavy reverse break. Some of these show a variety of undertypes.

I do not believe that the 1797 half-cents (there are several) overstruck on 1798 cents were either errors or experiments. They show every indication of being regular strikings in the same groups with others showing illegible undertypes. As for mint workmen being too uppity to use 1797 dies in 1800, this is impossdible either to prove or disprove. Considering the quality of surviving 1802 half cents, their technique had not improved much since 1797.

If you do run your trilogy through PW, you might do well to send a xerox of this letter to Dr. Lapp. And remember that I am not trying to be argumentative, but simply to clear up some misconceptions many of which are to be laid at the feet of earlier writers. When I published an earlier sequence, in the NN catalogues, I was unaware of the exiatence of 1797's overstruck on 1798 cents, as of certain late die break states which were only later described. If I didn't take your effort seriously I would n't bother to write you three pages about it!!

Best,

BULLSHIT

8/10/03

Dear Mother,

Thank you for Brian's comment on your article in the 1994 issue of American Scholar. As you know I have a "turn off" self-limit from learning all [illegible] the long [illegible]. Since then the way behind addition the theory problem with language, the same you should want to share what these problems.

It is my opinion that Joe Jaffe should read your article just as they are because you want to tell them. The most important thing is the [illegible] knowing it takes the trouble to get [illegible] what he thinks!! I feel grateful that perhaps my efforts have opened a door, also [illegible] action and this is what is needed!!

I would like to point out however that "at best an [illegible] response is an educated guess" (If you will notice page IX of my book I have had this set in italic type. Nothing in my mind stands out from other the statement. Are your words on page 4 "your state" then is no logical reason to [illegible] the [illegible] EACH WORD REPRESENTS AND SOLUTION TO AN INTELLECTUAL PUZZLE" (emphasis added) For these reasons I strongly support your efforts to no use [illegible] I am strongly [illegible] the educated response is a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

followed another in Orchestra Pit but there are traps which can not be guaranteed.

My Position on the Cannon sequence really has not changed from the book. However I also want to take issue with Walter Brown in Cartoon Days.

1794 - Note that the sequence is as follows (with numbers)
1 - 2 - 5-6-3 - 4 - 7 - 8 - 9 What the shows is that with the exception of the use of number 3 it was in sequence. One wallow sequence to ignore the determination of number 3. The break from 13 in LIBERTY which could run on CANN #6 is not seen on CANN #3, which is left as a blank stock after CANN #1. It is just now that he decides there should be a deliberate placing of # CANN #7 before CANN #8. There is no the determination evidence to support this position. The MG sequence the sequence of CANN #6 + CANN #7 was supported by the crowd and the unattempted use of the dice.

1795 - If you will note Brown and I are in complete agreement as to the PRESUMED sequence. However I hold reserve with some of his dates. Comments such as the remarks in Presidents just how the hell does he know that? The record of a ship is a very simple operation. Perhaps Walter has a Video tape taken of the Mint in 1795-96. While the statements are very strong and are the type of

writing that it appears to very strongly resemble the specimen shown as SW76 (some week would have) Walter Wesley, however, my opinion is good deal to be desired. It has become the Cathedral in Presentation and has carried over even to the Correspondence

1777 – The Emerson sequence of these dates appears to perhaps the most significant one in the whole Hull Coat series. Brown's presentation is interesting & may (if you will recall) in his article in the Coin Collector Journal (May-June 1954) he states that the latest edge specimen were struck first. Since that time the specimen struck during 1776 have come down to light. Walter, being a little on the stubborn side, now attempts to justify this with the fact he had obtained in 1777 & 1779. He also does not have Carter's article that KW Julian has come up with which lends credence to the Emerson sequence not forgetting my book. Also note Walter's claim that the shallow die state of obverse #1 was used in 1779. This is due to his SW76 in the Coin Collector Journal article and as before it's difficult to admit to a published error.

The new data from the archives establishes that the Copper Purchase of planchets on December 13, 1796 was from one William Talbott, who was the Talbott

of Talbot Allen + Co.

Based on the evidence I have come up with the following Conclusion which is Guesswork but is Partially supportable by Facts.

The total Coins struck in the spring of 1797 was 119,218 which were delivered to the Treasurer of the Mint as follows

Spring of 1797	107,048
Spring of 1799	12,170
	119,218

These were struck on planchets from the following Sources

TAC TOKENS	90,527
Spanish coin	1,164
Sheet Copper	27,527
	119,218

The Number of TAC Tokens from the purchase of 1916 the on 12/5/1916 was 90,527 The Mint even kept a record of the weights (stated) from the shipment which when added to the weight of 90,547 Half Cent planchets approximately defined the weight purchase from William Talbot.

What this method shows is OK as far as it goes but the Next question Remains What Variables were struck?

I have yet to see an obverse #3 struck over a TAC token but Most if Not all 1797 Cent #1's are. My placing of the use of obverse #3 in 1800 is partially a Negative one in that I can not see how these specimens which are all overstruck on large cents could have been produced in the 1797 Coinage as reported by the Mint. However in 1800 prior to the arrival of the Boulton Planchets the Mint produced Half Cents from 101 lbs of spoiled large cents therefore I have arbitrarily placed the 1797 obverse #3 as being produced at the time for No other reason than a lack of any other place to put them. So you can see My "pattern is Not fixed and if some one can come up with more evidence or ideas I love it so that the intellectual puzzle of the emission sequence can move towards, but never arrive at, its conclusion.

Thanks again Will that was good to hear from you any get Dr Sapp to publish.

Sincerely

Bogle

P.S. you can give this letter to Dr Sapp for inclusion in P.C. in an unedited state if you want to.

MILTON B. PFEFFER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ONE EAST 57TH STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
212 MURRAY HILL 8-8880

May 17, 1973

Dear Roger:

I thank you very much for your last letter. It was a pleasure reading it and I'm sure it's going to be even more of a pleasure studying it. In the meantime, I've sent a Xerox copy to Dr. Lopp, so that the pertinent portions can be included in the next two issues of P.W. I am finding all this very exciting and instructive!

Putting this aside, there are two things I wanted to say to you. First, regarding the 1794 CMM8, you mention at page 9 that you never saw the reverse break mentioned by Sullal. I must show you my coin, because I believe I have that break, even though the coin is worn (12/6).

Secondly, regarding the 1826 CMM2, it might be worth noting that the line under CENT is somewhat pointed at the right end, which is another way of distinguishing it from 1826 CMM1. Also, in my specimen, the E in STATES is definitely repunched, along with HALF CENT (and possibly also the RICA in AMERICA, though I am not very sure of that.) At page 69 you have some discussion of repunching the reverse dies.

I have recently bought, from Bill Smith, the 1794 CMM5

that Ray Chatham had. It was offered as "Ex-Cobon" for $22.5
so I suppose it is the same corn as you tested in your
FPL #1 for the same price, and at the same grade (VF 20).
If any pedigree came with the corn when you got it, I'd
like to know it.

Sincerely,

Walt

MILTON B. PFEFFER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ONE EAST 57TH STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
212 MURRAY HILL 8-8880

May 17, 1973

Dear Warren:

I enclose a copy of Roger Cohen's letter to me of May 10, 1973. This is with his permission, as you will see from his postscript. It would be great to include his comments, along with Walter Breen's, in the next two articles (1995 and 1997). It's too bad we did not have it in time for the May 15 issue.

Being somewhat faint-hearted, I believe a little pruning of Roger's remarks will be in order. You will see what I mean, after you have read it.

I plan to put together a sort of wrap-up article, not to debate further the controversial issues, but rather to sum up, and look at the scene with a wide angle lens.

Sincerely,

Milt

cc Roger A. Cohen, M.D.
4720 Montgomery Lane
Bethesda, Md., 20014

C 10/19/73

Dear Milly,

Received Penny - when a few days ago - and I was very glad to see that Dr Kopp has seen you & was satisfied. I enjoyed the Editors note and I take it for granted that my Dinnerset was received, accordingly I am ~~sending~~ sending another letter which will always look after

I suppose that my last letter is really until after you get back from your visit to Philadelphia & the Pacific Coast. I expect you will write from Los Angeles & I am really keeping the same things in this new letter but in a different way. I am going to try to remember my impressions towards Boston in the late 90's & really want to know how to do on the Pacific Coast - Penny - wise

I had quite forgotten the amount of time towards Boston but it would only be half down & up. Perhaps Mayo may not know if you take many books to publish but I think before I left I did see a very short paragraph from you & make know my publisher. It is quite apparent that Walter has had some recent thoughts. Which I gather from Sam that is the result of the Inherent that he has had Mr Edwards in the back for years. Now that my book is out there is the reason for him & Andrew to look at it & back. My best gives all to you in the person. Who was able to get it out of him.

You state the "Crack in the great wall" has
widened perhaps more with Watergate. Nixon's staff
took for anything to unravel, the same
characteristics of the tapes. If you discover them you
can come up with the same with approval answers.

Some thought the above the most that brought
your of 8/77 then see that you also have some
new information which are second thought for
me. You might write an Rabbi Max Ligg and tell him
a bit of setting my letter.

You have publicity of book shows seen and
acquired a copy #8 of 1972 with the reverse the
book. You might also take a look on your for
those words which follow back of the book with
pile on the reverse. Mine has a very provincial
chart.

Your point of reference on the 1972 copy #2 is
1881 Tolson but on worn expression of the not appeared then
the most obtuse. For the most part of time is but obtuse not
which would have appeared very worn expression. The E in Tolson
is definitely expanded. However the R.C.A. in conversation
appears to be expanded to more. As time goes on these
minor minor obtuseness will be noted in the varieties
of what of dollar. My hope to varieties would keep
to complete.

Yes the 1944 Cam #5 is the same that was on my FPL #1 I purchased it from US Chemicals about 3 years ago. It's not a Cabin Cam but is in the line of my "Pedigree"

That's all for now and look for my new letter in a few Days

Sincerely

Roger

June 8, 1973

Dear Milton,

In accordance with my letter of May 19, I am setting forth some of my observations on your articles on the emission sequences of 1794, 1795 and 1797.

First of all, I am very happy to see someone else tackle and publish his thoughts on the "intellectual puzzle" of emission sequence. You are to be congratulated on your effort. In the twenty years prior to the publication of my book, there was very little published and most of what was published was in auction sales catalogues. Now, in less than two years, half cent collectors will have more thoughts on this interesting riddle.

As you will note in my book, I do not state how I arrived at my presumed emission sequence. I did this for a number of reasons. First and foremost is the fact that "at best an emission sequence is an educated guess." This is a direct quote from my book, on page IX. You might note I even had this set in italic type. Secondly, the records in The National Archives only provide some clues to a few of the riddles presented by observation of the coins. In writing my book, I was careful not to state certain things as facts unless I could back them up with either a coin I had seen or a document which was in The National Archives. Whenever I made a supposition or guess, I clearly stated that it was a supposition or guess.

Specifically, on 1794, your article was very thought provoking. However, I note that you seem to be laboring on what I call the "single press theory." I also discussed this in my book on page IX and, again, I believe there is no absolute answer. In preparing my emission sequence, the concept of a second press very nicely disposed of the problem of what to do with the tie of CMM #3 to CMM #4. Also note that this is reverse-oriented progression. I note that you consider my emission sequence to be obverse-oriented. I disagree with your statement. My emission sequence uses as many ties as possible. It could have been that reverses D, E and B stayed in presses at the time of their use or switched to a second or third press. I just don't know and, like you, I can only assume from existing specimens.

For the year 1794, there is virtually nothing in The National Archives records to even make any surmises on. The coins themselves have to do the talking. However, the cent production of 918,521 against 81,600 half cents gives an indication of which denomination got first priority as to production. It is also worth noting that the coiner delivered to the Treasurer (not necessarily struck) the last half cents in the third quarter of that year. From this it can be assumed that the striking of half cents ceased before September 30th so that the press time available could be used for the striking of other denominations.

The 1795 dated specimen appears at this time to have much more supporting data in The National Archives than do the 1794's, so that the emission sequence and certain peripheral information can be stated with some justification. This data is in addition to what can be put together by just observing the coins, which is apparently what you did. The only mistake, from my viewpoint, was that you placed planchet weight as a preference over die deterioration.

The National Archives has provided some interesting data. The most important item in Record Group 104 is the "Account Book for the Delivery of Cents and Half Cents 1796-1803," which was kept by the Treasurer of the Mint, not the Chief Coiner, as has been surmised by other writers. As a professional accountant, I found this book to be a very interesting example of late 18th Century accounting work. This interesting book of account was used for recording day-to-day transactions of the Mint's Treasurer. He debited (charged) himself with copper when he received it. He then credited himself when he disposed of it. He could receive copper from an outside source such as Boulton, or he could receive it from the Chief Coiner. An example of the latter is spoiled cents for which there are a number of entries. When the Treasurer of the Mint disposed of copper, it was usually in the form of finished cents or half cents, and the name of the person to whom the finished coins were sold (vended) was entered in the account book. Occasionally deliveries of copper to the Chief Coiner were entered, but not always. The accounting records at this time, especially for internal Mint transfers of copper, seem to be incomplete. What is missing is the general ledger, which is another book of account. It may be in The National Archives and as yet unrecognized, or perhaps it has been lost.

As I stated in my book on pages VIII and 15, the reason for thick, wider, plain edge planchets used on die combinations 3-C and 3-D of 1795 is unknown to me. I could guess that they were made from the "account book" entry of March 9, 1796, where it is stated, "There was 33 lb of spoiled cents maid in 1/2 cents & weighed again". Since writing the book, I have acquired a 1795 half cent of die combination 3-C, which clearly shows the cent undertype. Interestingly enough, the cent reverse undertype is brockage. It is clearly struck from a spoiled cent. The coin weighs 103.3 grains and is in condition 4.

It is my opinion that the edge lettering is the determining factor on the change in weight which was effected in December 1795 on the cent and apparently in January or February 1796 on the half cent. The 1795 die combination 1-A has great variation in weight of the planchets. In my collection they vary from 118.5 grains to 77.4 grains. I consider these coins just to be the product of not too careful work.

My position on the emission sequence of 1795 has not changed from the book. If you will note, they tie together on a single press. However, I do not necessarily believe that they were struck at one time. It is entirely possible that the dies were removed from the press so that another denomination could be coined. When half cent coinage resumed, it was just coincidence that the dies used fit into the emission sequence which I outlined in my book.

I note that you skipped the 1796 dated coinage, which perhaps is the thing to do, except for the fact that they are so well known to date collectors. To variety collectors all they represent is a large outlay for single R-5 and R-6 varieties. My position on the 1796's is unchanged from the book, except that the more I see of these coins the more I believe what I guessed at. At the present time I know of three examples of CMM #1 and six examples of CMM #2 in condition 50 or higher. Have you ever noticed that in 1796 the Mint coined all the authorized denominations and the fact that a number of higher condition examples are extant of all denominations? This leads me to believe that in 1796 specimen sets were made, which have long since been broken up. The variety of 1796 half cents which was in these specimen sets (if they were minted) is unknown to me, and I really couldn't even guess. The 1796 dated specimens appear to have all been struck by October 14, 1796.

The emission sequence of the coinage dated 1797 is perhaps one of the most difficult one in the half cent series. Its beginning is recorded in the "Account Book" under the date December 12, 1796, where it is stated, "By copper recd in planchets for Half Cents - 1914 lb".

In my book I stated that the source of this copper was unknown to me. Since that time Mr. R. W. Julian of Logansport, Indiana, has generously provided me with some data he got, and which I missed, at The National Archives. The new data establishes that the copper purchase of planchets on December 12, 1796 was from one William Talbot, who was probably the Talbot of Talbot Allum & Lee. Based on this evidence, I have come up with the following conclusion, which is guesswork, but is partially supported by the facts.

The total coins struck in the spring of 1797 was 119,218, which were delivered (not necessarily struck) to the Treasurer of the Mint as follows:

Spring of 1797	107,048
Spring of 1799	12,170
	119,218

These were struck on planchets from the following apparent sources.

TAL Tokens	90,527
Spoiled Cents	1,164
Sheet Copper	27,527
	119,218

The number of TAL tokens from the purchase of 1,914 lbs. on Dec/12/1796 was 90,527. The Mint even kept a record of the wastage (shruf) from this shipment which, when added to the weight of 90, 527 half cent planchets, approximately equals the weight of the purchase from William Talbot.

What I've outlined above is interesting as far as it goes, but the next question posed is, what varieties were struck? I have yet to see an obverse 3 struck over a TAL token, but most, if not all, 1797 CMM #1's are. Also, numerous 1797 CMM #2's are overstrikes. My placing of the use of obverse 3 in 1800 is a negative one in that I cannot see how these specimens, which are apparently all overstruck on spoiled large cents, could have been minted in the coinage deliveries reported in the "Account Book" in 1797 and 1799. However, in 1800, prior to the arrival of the ready-made Boulton planchets, the Mint coined half cents from 161 lbs. of spoiled large cents. Therefore, I have arbitrarily placed the 1797 obverse 3 as being minted at this time for no other reason than a lack of another place to put them. As you can see, my position is not final, and if someone can come up with more evidence or ideas, I will appreciate it, so that the intellectual puzzle of the emission sequence can move towards, but never arrive at, its conclusion.

Thanks again, Milt. It was good to hear from you, and I'll be looking forward to seeing this in P-W without a lot of pruning.

Sincerely,

MILTON B. PFEFFER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ONE EAST 57TH STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
212 MURRAY HILL 8-8880

June 14, 1973

Dr Warren A. Jopp,
480 Herkimer Street,
Brooklyn, N.Y., 11213

Dear Warren:

I enclose a copy of Roger Cohen's letter to me of June 8, 1973. A lot of new information is packed into its three pages, and it really would be a pity if editorial requirements caused substantial deletions.

I'm often told that free advice is worth as much as it costs. But that has never stopped me from making suggestions. As here goes: (1) you might consider running the letter as a separate article; or (2) you might carry the 1794 and 1795 portions of the letter in the next issue of P-W, and the 1797 portion in the issue following the next one.

All this half-cent debating has been like a shot in the arm to me. I'm putting together another short article covering newly discovered (& belated) due bracks, so you can count on still another half cent article for P-W in the near future.

Sincerely

Milt

cc Roger D. Cohen

BOWIE, MD. 20715

6/16/73

Dr Warren A Lapp
480 Herkimer St.
Brooklyn N.Y. 11213

Dear Dr Lapp;

Milt Pfeffer has sent me a copy of his letter to you of 6/14/73 in which he made suggestions as to what to do with my letter to him.

At the risk of putting my "4 Half Cents Worth" in, when I wrote the letter I was thinking of your possible job. Accordingly I would like to have the first two pages in the Next P.W. FOLLOWING Breens comments on the 1795. Even though there is no conclusion at that point there is a good breaking point. ~~After~~

After reading the letter over for the 15th time I would like to request that ~~that~~ any changes or deletions be communicated to me. In addition I would like transpose two paragraphs on page 2 I am enclosing an illustration of what I mean.

The material on page 3 (1797) should again follow Breens comments on 1797 in the Sept 15th issue, that is if that is the issue in which you plan to publish

Sincerely
Roger L Cohen

Received 12/73

Catalogue Sales of the Circulating Half Cents
by Walter B. Pfeiffer

I have examined roughly 250 catalogues and fixed price lists to see what information could be gathered about the circulating half cents, that is, half cents other than the proofs, the so-called 1811 "restrike" and the 1837 token. I was especially interested in their (1) provenance, (2) die states, (3) planchet states and (4) condition classification. This information has been summarized, and is here presented in the hope that other half cent collectors will add to it their own information. I should like very much to hear from those who can further trace the coins, who know their present whereabouts, or who can supply any other data. I regard this study as a sort of banking transaction: the more deposits (of information) that are made, the more there is to withdraw.

Catalogues, of course, have their limitations. (1) Overgrading is rife. Blame both sides: the seller for his cupidity, the buyer for his stupidity. (2) Attributions can be inaccurate, whether by the cataloguer or by the reader, based upon incomplete information set forth in the catalogue. (3) Typographical errors in Sheldon number designations unquestionably exist. (4) The former owners of coins are seldom given, so that "repeaters" may be present in abundance,

Wobbly condition causes infraction difficult to come by. The inexcusable failure of nearly all catalogues to give the weights and planchet diameters of the early half cents, adds to the difficulty of tracing them.

Despite this, there is much to be learned from the catalogues, and that is the reason for this monograph. In reviewing them, I have made notes of the higher grade coins, and of some ~~of the~~ interesting lower grade ones. No attempt has been made to list each and every offering. I have taken the catalogues' grading as accurate for the time being; and where I have found the coin re-graded in another catalogue, I have shown it. What I would really like are the views of other persons, having personal knowledge, who may disagree with the catalogue grading, attribution, or pedigree or condition classification.

I have altogether ignored prices. From Adam Smith to John Maynard Keynes, and beyond, the wayside is littered with the wrecks of discarded price theories. Someone else will have to work at that, not me. Besides, I do not approve of the recent "investment" interest in numismatics, and the use of coins as an extension of Wall Street activities.

1793 G-1, CHM-3

Uncirculated grades: (1) C. MORRIS 857 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1905), A. W. JACKMAN 851 (H. CHAPMAN, 1910); (2) R.B. WILSON 1000 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895), D. S. WILSON 985 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (3) M.A. STICKNEY 1667 (H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (4) T.L. ELDER 201 (2-25-1909); (5) C.S. BEMENT 413 (H. CHAPMAN, 1916); (6) U.S. COIN CO., INC. 1 (5/1915); (7) T.J. CLARKE, C.M. WILLIAMS (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (8) C. STEIGERWALT, J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), C. JAY 80 (STACK'S, 1967).

AU grades: (9) B.E. ROACH 3246 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (10) DAVIS-GRAVES 81 (STACK'S, 1954); (11) L. MERKIN 528 (6/1971).

EF grades: (12) DR. G.P. FRENCH 348 (U.S. COIN CO. 12-5-1917); (13) J. C. HILLS 238 (L.H. LOW, 12-1-1923); (14) T.L. ELDER 2145 (4-11-1925); (15) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 318 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (16) B.M. MEHL 2 (114th Sale, 1951); (17) H. RYDER 260 (NN 44th Sale, 1954); (18) R.L. MILES, JR. 1 (STACK'S, 1969).

VF grades: (19) G.H. EARLE 3597 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (20) H.O. GRANBERG 534 (B.M. MEHL, 1919); (21) J. TEN EYCK 990 (B.M. MEHL, 1922); (22) F.R. ALVORD 1 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (23) L.P. JONES 352 (T.L. ELDER, 1922); (24) F. BALDENHOFER 73 (STACK'S, 1955); (25) G.O. WALTON 42 (STACK'S, 1963).

The catalogues' notes for this variety are not

very enlightening. While some coins are said to have been perfectly struck, we learn that others are "weakish, at borders" (Anderson-Dupont 1031, Stack's 1954) or on the right side (Bement). A number show evidence of rusted dies, both obverse and reverse, "as always noted on this variety" (NN 56th Sale, 1962). In addition, there are the usual off-center strikes, planchet defects, rough planchets and corrosion spots.

The 1793 half cents are, in my opinion, the most beautiful of the entire series; and it is a great pleasure to see just the plate of such specimens as the Norris-Jackman, or the Winsor-Wilson. The colors of the uncirculated coins are said to range ~~between~~ from reddish-brown (Bolstan) to various shades of brown and olive.

Not a single die break is reported

CMM #4

1793 G-2, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) L.G. PARMALEE 678 (BANGS & Co., 1890), E.W. ROPES 419 (BANGS & Co., 1893), attribution and pedigree from marginal notes in ANS copies of Ropes catalogue); (2) T. CLENEAY 1936 (CHAPMAN BROS. 1890); (3) R.B. WINSOR 999 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895), BORDEN collection, A.W. JACKMAN 852 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (4) J.G. MILLS 1397 (H. CHAPMAN, 1964); (5) P. MOUGEY 287 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (6) W.H. WOODIN 797 (T.L. ELDER, 1911), H. RYDER 261 (NN 44th Sale, 1954). In the Ryder Sale, the coin is graded 40 over 60. The ANS copy of the Wooden catalogue has the name "Ryder" written in the margin opposite lot 797 and "Ex. F." in pencil; (7) G.H. EARLE 3598 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (8) H.C. MILLER 1022 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (9) T.L. ELDER 1656 (4/1921); (10) T.L. ELDER 2146 (4/1925); (11) ANDERSON GAL. 40 (W. RAYMOND, 4-2-1926); (12) T.J. CLARKE, C.M. WILLIAMS 670 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (13) B.M. MEHL 1 (114th Sale, 1951); (14) M.A. HOLMES 1283 (STACK'S, 1960); (15) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), E.H. GARDNER 1109 (STACK'S, 1965)

EF grades: (16) A.W. CRANS 622 (U.S. COIN CO., 1918); (17) NN 56th Sale 413 (1962).

VF grades: (18) NN 59th Sale 1112 (1967), ex. T.L. ELDER 12-6-1906, as EF; (19) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1032 (STACK'S, 1954); (20) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 448 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (21) S.W. WOLFSON 1 (STACK'S, 1963); (22) EMPIRE

Sale 71 (STACK'S, 1957); (23) F.R. ALVORD 4 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (24) ~~SUP~~ DURHAM Sale 75 (SUPERIOR, 1973).

Catalogues' notes call attention to the recutting of R. in AMERICA (NN 56 # Sale). Its presence is taken to signify an early state of the die, before it faded from wear. Also, rusted dies, chisel marks, patina formation, full beading and sharpness of impression are mentioned. As with the previous variety, no die breaks are reported.

Of the many catalogues I examined, there were no AU's and only two EF's listed for this variety, an unusual "scatter."

The reverse of the Worden-Ryder specimen is the Gilbert plate coin.

1793 G-3, CAM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B WINSOR 1001 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (2) J.G. MILLS 1399 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (3) M.A STICKNEY 1169 (H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (4) G.H EARLE 3599 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912), H RYDER 259 (NN 44th Sale, 1954); ~~(5) FED. BRAND ENTERPRISES~~ (5) "MILLION DOLLAR AUCTION" 1 (FEDERAL BRAND, 1963); (6) L. MERKIN 27 (9/1968), not previously auctioned.

MS60

AU grades: (7) T. J. CLARKE, C.M. WILLIAMS 671 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (8) J. KELLY 21 (CENTRAL STATES AUCT., 1957); (9) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963).

EF grades: (10) A.W. JACKMAN 853 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (11) J.C. HILLS 240 (L.H. LOW, 1923); (12) F.R. ALVORD 6 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (13) ANDERSON GAL. 41 (W. RAYMOND, 1926); (14) S.W. FREEMAN 1033 (KREISBERG & SCHULMAN, 1954); (15) GRANT PIERCE 1 (STACK'S, 1965); (16) "TERRELL" COLL. 1 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1971)

VF grades: (17) R.B. LEEDS 988 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1111 (1967); (18) L.P. JONES 353 (T.L. ELDER, 1922); (19) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 320 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (20) W.W. NEIL 2193 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (21) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1030 (STACK'S, 1954); of Alvord, sale and lot number not specified; (22) F. BALDENHOFER 74 (STACK'S, 1955); (23) P.G. STRAUS 49 (STACK'S, 1959); (24) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 851 (2/1960); (25) R.A. ARNEL 1 (STACK'S, 1967); (26) ARMAND CHAMPA 589 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1972).

93 G3

(8)

The Foster Merkam catalogue for the sale of September, 1968 says that such most state staples were known at that time. Colors range from light brown with reddish hues to darker shades. Many of the catalogue descriptions refer to planchet defects and clips. Some mention granularity, but the great majority do not.

Apparently, many specimens show evidence of rusting (both obverse and reverse) although this is rarely mentioned.

There is no report of a broken die.

~~1294~~ 1293 G-4, CMM-1

There is considerable controversy here.

Uncirculated grades: (1) J.G. MILLS 1400 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (2) G.H. EARLE 3600 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (3) F.R. ALVORD 8 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), ANDERSON-DUPONT 1029 (STACK'S, 1954); ALTO COLL. 513 (STACK'S, 1970), said to derive from "an early B. Max Mehl Sale." Some doubt about the claim of the Earle specimen to MS condition exists. The NN 61st Sale catalogue grades it as AU50.

AU grades: (5) H.P. SMITH 1188 (CHAPMAN BROS., MAY, 1906), G.H. EARLE (above), DR. T. HALL, VIRGIL BRAND, B.G. JOHNSON, HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 93 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968); (6) METROPOLITAN N.Y. NUMIS. CONV., ~~150~~ 160 (STACK'S, 1962); (7) R.E. COX 160 (STACK'S, 1962); (8) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), R.T. DAVIS 1 (STACK'S, 1968), L. MERKIN 590 (3/1969), R.L. TOLLETT 1 (STACK'S, 1971). The Brobston-Davis-Merkin-Tollett coin was graded AU each time it was offered for sale, but in the NN 61st Sale catalogue it is described as EF, cleaned. The Smith-Earle-Hall-Brand-Johnson-Helfenstein-Judd coin was graded EF when sold in the H.P. Smith Sale, and thereafter re-graded up to AU.

EF grades: (9) J.S. JENKS 6235 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921), F.R. ALVORD 11 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), when it was graded VF; (10) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 450 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (11) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL."

HISTORY

93 C-4

321 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (12) F.W. GEISS 270 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (13) C.M. WILLIAMS 672 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (14) DR. A.C. BLACK, NN 61st sale 110 (1970).

VF grades: (15) PROF. W.E. HIDDEN (1912), H. RYDER 258 (NN 44th sale, 1954); (16) J.D. SWEYD 66 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (17) DR. G.P. FRENCH 349 (U.S. COIN CO., 12-5-1917); (18) A.W. JACKMAN 855 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (19) F. BALDENHOFER 75 (STACK'S, 1955); (20) B. FRANK 1 (STACK'S, 1956); (21) T.J. CLARKE 447 (A. KOSOFF, 1956).

This is the first variety that shows evidence of a die break and buckling. The edge of the reverse die breaks out over F AMER and buckling causes the reverse center to be weak. The catalogueers note that broken die specimens are fairly uncommon; and they also note such problems as porosity, weak impressions, off-center strikes and planchet clips. A number of coins are described as having "pen-point pricks."

A condition census extant for this variety was provided in the NN 61st sale catalogue, as follows: MS 65 (Alvord - "Dupont" - Bareford); AU 50 (Smith - Earle - Hall - Brand - Johnson - Helfgrotten - Judd); EF 45 (Dr Black - NN 61); EF 45 cleaned (Davis); EF 40 (R.H. Norwebb and Louis Eliasberg, ex J.H. Clapp).

The Hidden - Ryder - Sweyd reverse is illustrated in the Gilbert plate.

1794 G-1, CHM-9

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B. WINSOR 1002 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (2) J.G. MILLS 1405 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (3) H.P. SMITH 1189 (CHAPMAN BROS., MAY, 1906); (4) C.S. BEMENT 414 (H. CHAPMAN, 1916); (5) T.L. ELDER 2310 (5/1923); (6) F.R. ALVORD 13 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); ~~(7) L. MERKIN 94 (3/1968) MS 60~~; (7) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 94 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968), ex J. HEWITT JUDD, MS 60; (8) ALTO COLL. 514 (STACK'S, 1970); (9) ~~JESS PETERS, INC~~ ANA 1973 Lot 1676 (JESS PETERS, INC) mis-attributes as G-3,

AU grades: (10) R.T. DAVIS 2 (STACK'S, 1968).

EF grades: (11) A.W. JACKMAN 856 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (12) L.P. JONES 353 (T.L. ELDER, 1923); (13) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 452 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (14) W.C. ATWATER 124 (B.M. MEHL, 1946); (15) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1040 (STACK'S, 1954); (16) NN 54th Lot 1621 (1960); (17) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (18) L. MERKIN 27 (9/1967); (19) L. MERKIN 511 (10/1972); (20) QUAL. SALES 10 (1972)

VF grades: (21) D.S. WILSON 988 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (22) DR. G.P. FRENCH 350 (U.S. COIN CO, 1917); (23) T.L. ELDER 2147 (4-11-1925); (24) C.M. WILLIAMS 673 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (25) H. RYDER 267 (NN 44th Lot, 1954) cleaned, ex H.G. SAMPSON; (26) W.W. NEIL 2196 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (27) NN 56th Lot 415 (1962); (28) J. BROBSTON, another specimen, (1963); (29) A.R. TURINI 187 (STACK'S, 1972).

The die crack from border to Cupa, ~~unknown~~ to Sheldon, is noted by a number of catalogueers, but

they make no reference to the reverse rim breaks near the fraction. Not much is said about porosity, or planchet defects, or weak impressions ~~Apparently, most of the specimens of this variety look quite bad.~~

The obverse of the Alto coin is said to show 50% of mint color, blending to light brown. As happens so often in 1794, a coal-black example exists (the Bolsterin VF).

The Halfpenny-Judd coin, graded as "just about ~~[illegible]~~ Mint State-60" is said to be "probably second ~~[illegible]~~ finest known, certainly one of four finest." The H. P. Smith coin in 1906 was said by the Chapmans to be "probably the finest known."

~~The catalogue of the~~

The NN 54th Sale catalogue, under lot 1621, states that this variety normally exhibits a stronger obverse than reverse

1794 G-2, CMM-7

I found ~~three~~ five examples of this variety offered in four sales: (1) R.E. BROWN 451 (T.L. ELDER, 3/1918) graded about F, and with "break on rev." (2) and (3) F.R. ALVORD 15 (S.H. CHAPMAN, ~~Feb~~ 1924), with crack from border through E in UNITED to wreath, graded F; and also F.R. ALVORD 16, graded VG; (4) C.M. WILLIAMS 674 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) graded F 15; and (5) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) graded VF.

Other than the due breaks referred to above, the catalogues ~~are~~ offer no descriptions of the coins, nor is any condition census information supplied.

1794 G-3, CMM-8

I found the following: (1) F.R. ALVORD 17 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) VF, perfect obverse; (2) F.R. ALVORD 19, F, break from border through second T in STATES to A in HALF; (3) F.R. ALVORD 18, VG; (4) T.L. ELDER 336 (4/1925) G-3; (5) ANDERSON GAL. 43 (W. RAYMOND, 4-3-1926) described as lustrous brown, uncirculated; (6) W.W. NEIL 2196 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) graded VF over F; (7) C.M. WILLIAMS 675 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) obv. G8; (8) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) AU with planchet defect on left obverse rim; (9) J. BROBSTON, another, VF, reverse die broken from second T in STATES to wreath.

A curious edge is reported with the Alvord sale, lot 19, where there is a note: "Edge, ornament after A and DOLLAR." Lot 18, however, describes the usual edge: "ornament after DOLLAR."

1794 G-4, CMM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) T.L. ELDER 2311 (4/1923); (2) F.R. ALVORD 22 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), probably appearing again as L. MERKIN 512 (10/1972) graded EF and described as ex Alvord collection, without specifying lot 22 (unc.) or lot 20 (VF); (3) T.L. ELDER 2148 (4/1925) adding: "a gem, seldom equalled"; (4) C.M. WILLIAMS 676 (NUMIS. GAL., 195) MS 60; (5) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), E.H. GARDNER 1110 (STACK'S, 1965). The NN 59th Sale (1967) catalogue, under lot 1114, calls this specimen "nearly Mint State."

AU grades: (6) H.C. MILLER 1024 (T.L. ELDER, 1917), H. RYDER 226 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) graded EF45 over AU50); (7) S.H. McVITTY 2 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (8) B.M. MEHL 3 (114th Sale, 1951); (9) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 95 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968).

EF grades: (10) W.W. NEIL 2197 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (11) CENTURY SALE 55 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (12) NN 59th Sale 1114 (1967); (13) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 772 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (14) A.R. TURINI 188 (STACK'S, 1972).

VF grades: (15) R.E. BROWN 452 (T.L. ELDER, 1918) although the obverse plate looks better than VF; (16) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 438 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (17) F.R. ALVORD 20 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), probably appearing again as ANDERSON-DUPONT 1038 (STACK'S, 1954), where it is traced to Alvord without further specification and graded "almost EF 35"; (18) ANDERSON GAL. 44 (W. RAYMOND, 4-3-1926); (19) "MORRIS" SALE 868 (B.M. MEHL, 1931);

94 G-4

(20) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 323 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (21) T.J. CLARKE 448 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (22) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), "about" EF; (23) J. D. SWEYD 67 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (24) R.T. HERDEGEN 157 (SCHULMAN, 1973).

The catalogues in describing the die states do not add to those described by Zerbel, except that S.H. Chapman in the Alvord Sale (1924) adds one additional reverse crack from S to O. (Other reverse cracks are now known, however.) The obverse bulge is frequently mentioned. Its presence, together with clash marks, indicates an advanced die state. Colors range from light brown to black. Some uncirculated coins are said to show reddish color. Planchet defects are noted from time to time.

1794 G-5, CMM-2a (small edge letters)

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.C. MILLER 1025 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (2) GARRETT collection of Johns Hopkins (reported in RYDER catalogue (1954) under lot 264, and in S. FREEMAN catalogue (1958) under lot 1036); (3) S.W. FREEMAN 1036 (KREISBERG and SCHULMAN, 1958); (4) J. BROGSTON (reported in NN 61st Sale (1970) as borderline MS60, but without specifying the Brogston Sale of 1963, which contained only a VF specimen traced to Anderson-Dupont); (5) S.W. WOLFSON 2 (STACK'S, #1963), downgraded to EF 40 in NN 61st Sale (1970) where it is mentioned under lot 112, but not offered for sale:

AU grades: (6) G.H. EARLE 360 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912), H. RYDER 264 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) where it was downgraded to EF 40; (7) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 454 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (8) DR. C.A. ALLENBURGER 331 (B.M. MEHL, 1948); (9) WALTER BREEN (AU50-55, reported in NN 61 Sale catalogue, under lot 112); (10) NN 61st Sale 112 (1970) AU 50.

EF grades (in addition to EARLE-RYDER coins, above): (11) R.B. WINSOR 1003 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (12) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 455 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (13) S.H. CHAPMAN 2056 (T.L. ELDER, 1929); (14) M.A. HOLMES 1284 (STACK'S, 1960).

VF grades: (14) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 439 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (15) L.C. GEHRING 992 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (16) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 324 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (17) C.M. WILLIAMS 677 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950);

94 G-5

(18) GILHOUSEN SALE 2 (10/1973); (19) A-MARK (12/1972); (20) WAYNE SLIFE - G. JON HANSEN, VF30, referred to in NN 61 & the catalogue (1970) under lot 112.

A previously unpublished obverse die break, described as a "slight crack" from top of E through tops of RTY and into field for 1 mm, as mentioned in the S.W. FREEMAN Sale (1958). Since it has not been mentioned before, it ~~was~~ might be considered a late state of the obverse die. That obverse die was not used in combination with any other reverse, ~~so the new break does not help with the emission sequence problem~~ However, there are two sub-varieties, one with small edge lettering and one with large. These should now be re-examined closely, to determine possible order of emission.

Obverse suction marks are sometimes noted, as on the Freeman Sale, or Wayte Raymond's A.W. CRANS Sale, 1918, lot 623. Sometimes the clash marks are not recognized as such (Dr ~~Mann~~ Mares' description of "Fifth" variety).

~~In the Anderson-Dupont example, the reverse is weaker than obverse~~

In the "Dupont" - Brobston example, the reverse is weaker than the obverse. The Wolfson coin is weak in the area of UNITED. Colors range from light olive to cool-black. There is very little reference to porosity or other planchet problems.

The Earl - Ryder obverse is illustrated in the Gilbert plate.

1794 CMM 2b (large stay letters)

A single catalogue reference: (1) F.R. ALVORD 25 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), graded VG, with "eroded surface."

1794 G-6, CMM-6

Offered ten times, as follows: (1) T.L. ELDER 2313 (5/1923) EF; (2) F.R. ALVORD 28 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) VG; (3) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 456 (T.L. ELDER, 1927) F; (4) C.M. WILLIAMS 678 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) F15; (5) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1037 (STACK'S, 1954) F10; (6) NN 51st Sale 1164 (1958) AVG; (7) NN 57th Sale 2 (1963) VG10 over F15; (8) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) VF; (9) ALTO collection 515 (STACK'S, 1970) AU; (10) R.S. COHEN, JR. (FPL 4.1) F12. 1795

anverse or break between B and E

The Brobston catalogue reports a previously unpublished additional obverse ~~as~~ break from border beyond 4 to bust, forming a light bulge. Some planchets reveal granularity or pitting. One reverse is weakly struck at the lower right (NN 57th Sale). Colors range from light brown, green-olive to dark brown.

The Brobston catalogue points out that since the new obverse break (beyond 4 to bust) does not appear on G-7 or G-8, it proves G-6 was struck after those two varieties. Also, since the reverse shows no indication of a break through E of UNITED, it proves G-6 was struck before G-2.

[But see my discussion under G-7, the LAHRMAN coin, where the same bulge is apparently noted]

Lahrman coin was a G-6. While first sale

1794 G-7, CMM-3

I found this variety offered eight times: (1) J. G. MILLS 1401 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904) UNC.; (2) L.P. JONES 357 (T.L. ELDER, 1922) "fairly good"; (3) F.R. ALVORD 30 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) VG; (4) C.M. WILLIAMS 679 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 30; (5) B.M. MEHL 115th sale 1511 (1954) F; (6) L.G. LAHRMAN 50 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) VF 30; (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) G; (8) R.S. COHEN, JR. (FPL No. 1) VG-8.

The Mehl coin is the most startling, since it reports a die break from curl to border. But since the break is not reported on any other varieties bearing the same obverse, one should question either the attribution, or the observation, until the coin can be located and examined again. Perhaps it is a cloud mark, often reported for this obverse die, or a planchet scratch.

The Lahrman coin, not pictured in the catalogue, shows a swelling in the die to the right of 4. The Brobston G-6 (which has the same obverse die) was sold in the same year as the Lahrman coin, and there too the same bulge is seen, without the incusation marks on the Lahrman coin. The Brobston G-6 and the Lahrman G-7 bring back the key to the emission sequence riddle for G-6, G-7 and G-8. Traditionally, the solution was looked for in the extension of the rim break over BERTY. Now, the bulge and incusation marks add new factors. Further examples will have to be found and studied.

1794 is the year when coal-black specimens are seen fairly often. The Brobston coin is coal-black. Presumably, the jet black coins were struck on planchets made of a common alloy, and derived from a common source.

1794 G-P, CAM-5

Uncirculated grades: (1) F. W. GEISS 272 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (2) L. MERKIN 96 (3/1968).

AU grades: (3) HASELTINE Lot 843 (BANGS & CO., 1880); (4) C. JAY 81 (STACK'S, 1967) cleaned.

EF grades: (5) H. P. SMITH 1190 (CHAPMAN BROS., MAY, 1906).

VF grades: (6) T. L. ELDER (6-24-1921), H. RYDER 365 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) "about" VF 25; (7) F. R. ALVORD 31 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) DR. D. W. VALENTINE 457 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (9) C. W. WILLIAMS 680 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 25; (10) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1035 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 25; (11) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (12) R. S. COHEN, JR. (FPL M.I) VF 20.

The obverse run breaks over ERT, dash marks before neck, and perfect reverse is described in the L. MERKIN Catalogue, 9-18-68, under lot 29, as the "latest die state known." No reverse break is noted for any of the examples. Pitting and porosity are present, as usual, with some weak impressions, but the "average" strike is not weak. Where colors are mentioned, they are usually light olive to dark brown.

Higher grade VF specimens are probably condition census candidates.

1794 G-9, ~~CHAM~~ CHM-1a (large dry letters)

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1939 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890), J.G. MILLS 1406 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904), G.H. EARLE 3601 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912), H. RYDER 263 (NN 44th Sale, 1954), where it was re-graded as AU 55; (2) A.W. JACKMAN 857 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (3) T.L. ELDER 2708 (6/1932); (4) ~~R.E. COX 161 (STACK'S, 1962); (5) METRO. N.Y. NUMIS. CONV. SALE 11~~

R.E. COX 161 (STACK'S, METRO. N.Y. CONV., 1962); (5) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963)

AU grades: (6) B.E. ROACH 3247 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (7) C.M. WILLIAMS 681 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) AU 50; (8) P.G. STRAUS 54 (STACK'S, 1959); (9) L. MERKIN 591 (3/1969); (10) D.I. McKAY 325 (PARKE BERNET, 1969).

EF grades: (11) DR. G.P. FRENCH 351 (US COIN CO., 1917); (12) H.O. GRANBERG 536 (B.M. MEHL, 1919); (13) T.L. ELDER 1657 (4/1921); (14) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 458 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (15) S.H. McVITTY 3 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (16) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1033 (STACK'S, 1954); (17) R.E. COX 162 (STACK'S, METRO. N.Y. NUMIS. CONV., 1962); (18) W. VAN RODEN 104 (STACK'S, 1968)

VF grades: (19) R.B. WINSOR 1004 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (20) D.S. WILSON 986 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907), which looks considerably better, judging from the plate; (21) T.L. ELDER 1657 (4/1921); (22) F.R. ALVORD 34 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (23) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 326 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (24) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 459 (T.L. ELDER, 1927), W.W. NEIL 2200 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (25) NN 56th Sale 414 (1962) VF 35; (26) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 98 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968).

VF grades include: (19) R.B. WINSOR 1004 (1875); (20) D.S. WILSON 986 (1907), which looks considerably better, judging from the plate; (21) T.L. ELDER 1657 (1921); (22) F.R. ALVORD 34 (1924); (23) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 326 (1945); (24) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 458 (1927), appearing again as W.W. NEIL 2200 (1947); (25) NN 56th SALE 414 (1962), VF35; (26) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 97 (1968).

~~No die breaks, bulging or die sinking is noticeable, although~~

The Hellyer Ryder coin was described as exhibiting reverse rim crumbling at 6 AE. ~~and look to be~~ But the Enquire pamphlet, and Roger S. Cohen identify the condition as a die flaw from the M to the ~~border~~ border. Clash marks are sometimes found, both obverse and reverse. ~~and a recutting of 179~~

Some examples are described as granular or pitted. Colors range from light brown and light olive shades to darker browns. Blackish planchets are also noted.

The Dr French specimen is said to show "slight weakness at date," and the Brabstin specimen ~~is said to show~~ a recutting of 179. Weak date examples may therefore be early die states

The Dr. French reverse is illustrated on the Bullard plate

1794 Small edge letters, CMM 1b

One specimen seen by me:

(1) F.R. ALVORD 36 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), graded F. "Slight defect on edge."

1795 G-1, CHAI

Uncirculated grades: (1) HASELTINE Sale 849 (BANGS & CO., 1880); (2) R.B. WINSOR 1007 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (3) J.G. MILLS 1407 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (4) D.S. WILSON 993 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (5) C.S. BEMENT 46 (H. CHAPMAN, 1916); (6) H.S. MILLER 1026 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (7) J.C. HILLS 250 (L.H. LOW, 12-1-1923); (8) F.R. ALVORD 38 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (9) B.E. ROACH 3242 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (10) DR. C.A. ALLENBURGER 379 (B.M. MEHL, 1948); (11) B.M. MEHL 6 (1144 Sale, 1951); (12) DAVIS-GRAVES 85 (STACK'S, 1954); (13) T.J. CLARKE 449 (KOSOFF, 1956); (14) S.W. FREEMAN 1037 (KREISBERG and SCHULMAN, 1958); (15) R.A. ARNEL 2 (STACK'S, 1967); (16) R.L. MILES 3 (STACK'S, 1969).

AU grades: (17) S.H. McVITTY 4 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (18) W.S. ATWATER 127 (B.M. MEHL, 1946); (19) NN 56 Sale 417 (1962), "choice MS 60"; (20) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (21) QUAL. SALES CORP. 11 (3/1972).

EF grades: (22) H.P. SMITH 1192 (CHAPMAN BROS., 5/1906); (23) H.P. SMITH 953 (CHAPMAN BROS, 6/1906), NN 59 Sale 1116 (1967), L. MERKIN 529 (6/1971), sharpness of AU50, but scratched and nicked and hence graded EF 45; (24) U.S. COIN CO. 96 (6-20-1917); (25) T.L. ELDER 2151 (4-11-1925); (26) ANDERSON GAL. 46 (4-3-1926); (27) S.H. CHAPMAN 2058 (T.L. ELDER, 1929); (28) G.H. HALL 99 (STACK'S, 1945); (29) W.W. NEIL 2201 (B.M.

MEHL, 1947); (30) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1042 (STACK'S, 1954), EF 35; (31) F. BALDENHOFER 80 (STACK'S, 1955); (32) CENTURY SALE 56 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (33) GRANT-PIERCE 3 (STACK'S, 1965); (34) L. MERKIN 513 (10/1972).

VF grades: (35) C.M. WILLIAMS 682 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 30; (36) H. RYDER (NN44 Sale, 1954) VF35 & DAVID PROSKEY as EF; (37) J. BROBSTON, another specimen, (1963) "about" EF; (38) L.G. LAHRMAN 51 (KOSOFF, 1963); (39) A. SHUFORD 130 (KOSOFF, 1968); (40) R.T. HERDEGEN 158 (SCHULMAN, 1973).

The Mills coin was called "proof" and the obverse of the Wilson coin was also called proof. There is a fair chance that old condition census coins are mint state.

No support is found in the cataloguers' notes for Delbert's statement that the obverse "sometimes shows a die break before the 1 of the date." The planchets are generally free from flaws, and the impressions are generally strong and well-centered. The colors are the customary shades of brown, and occasionally it is said that traces of red are discernible. Planchet weights vary from the 104 grain standard. The uncirculated Alvord coin weighs 111 1/2 grains.

195 G-1

One example of this variety, formerly in the Brobston collection, was struck on a light weight flan, but with a lettered edge. In the Brobston catalogue, it was classified as VG, and ~~stated~~ its weight was given as 77¼ grains. No other specimens are known. Perhaps it may be traced to B.M. MEHL 94th Sale 257 (11-28-39), where it was described, as follows: "Lettered edge, but thin planchet. G-2. Rarity 6. About fine; some nicks on rev. edge."

1795 G-3, CMM-2a

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1941 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890); (2) R.B. WINSOR 1009 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (3) J.G. MILLS 1408 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (4) D.S. WILSON 990 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (5) A.W. JACKMAN 859 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (6) F.R. ALVORD 44 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) F.R. ALVORD 45 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) G.E. CHATILLON 1636 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (9) F.W. GEISS 274 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), re-graded to AU 55 when it appeared as L.G. LAHRMAN 52 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (10) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (11) L. MERKIN 593 (3/1969); (12) HATHAWAY and BOWERS GAL., MAY, 1970.

AU grades: (13) W. RAYMOND 7 (5/1915), possibly an H.O. GRANBERG coin; (14) H.C. MILLER 1028 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (15) B.E. ROACH 3250 (B.M. MEHL, 1944).

EF grades: T.L. ELDER 680 (6-5-1911); (17) B.M. MEHL 111th Sale 8 (1951); (18) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1044 (STACK'S, 1954) EF 35.

VF grades: (19) HASELTINE Sale 848 (BANGS & CO., 1880); (20) T.L. ELDER 205 (2-25-1909); (21) C.M. WILLIAMS 683 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 30; (22) H. RYDER 269 (NN 44th Sale, 1954); (23) CENTURY Sale 58 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (24) L. MERKIN 91 (3/~~1968~~ 1967) VF 30; (25) R.L. MILES 4 (STACK'S, 1969)

Another coin ought to be mentioned here, although there is some question whether it is properly classified as G-3, CHM-2a. ~~to~~ I am referring to the E.W. ROPES Sale of 1893 conducted by BANGS & CO. Under lot 422, the catalogue describes, unequivocally, the lettered-edge, punctuated date, and calls it "unexcelled." However, in the ANS copy of the Ropes catalogue, someone pencilled out the lettered-edge, punctuated date description, and in the margin there is a pencil reference to "Parmelee 714." ~~In~~ On examining the L.G. PARMALEE Sale of 1890 (BANGS & CO), I found under lot 714 a description of the coin again as lettered edge, punctuated date, sharp, "proof surface," and light obv. This catalogue has a plate of the obverse (only), and the die shown is G-1, CHM-1. Hence, if the plate is erroneous, this coin is an example of G-3, CHM-2a, and one of the finest known. Otherwise it is G-1, CHM-1, assuming the lettered edge description is accurate, and also one of the finest known.

95 G-3

Looking at the photos of different reverse specimens, it is clear that the reverse started to fail during the G-3 strikings, rather than during G-1. These failings include, according to the cataloguers, (1) warping of AMER, (2) ~~weak~~ die sinking of HALF CENT, and (3) a previously unpublished "faint die break of A in HALF," as seen on the F.W. GEISS coin. A well-advanced swelling of MER was considered the intermediate die state, according to the catalogue of the Lester Merkin, March, 1967 sale, under lot 91.

There is not much mention of porosity or planchet problems, ~~[illegible]~~ although the Hellyer Ryder coin has a reverse rim planchet defect.

As with the previous variety, there are variations from the 104 grain standard weight. The Alvord 44, for example, weighs 106 grains (uncirculated).

The range of colors is very wide, if the descriptions are accurate: olive are faded red (Bradstreet); light orange olive (Alvord); light olive (Jackson); partly bright red (Mills); brown (Gess).

1795 G-4, CMM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) E.W. ROPES 424 (BANGS & CO., 1893); (2) G.E. CHATILLON 1637 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), the second specimen listed, with planchet clip; (4) T. KING (M. FOLLETT, Gen World, 10-24-73 at page 33).

AU grades: (5) HASELTINE Sale 845 (BANGS & CO., 1880); (6) W.C. ATWATER 125 (B.M. MEHL, 1946); (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), the first specimen listed, appearing again as R.L. MILES 5 (STACK'S, 1969); (8) L. MERKIN 594 (3/1969).

EF grades: (9) H.C. MILLER 1029 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (10) J.S. JENKS 6240 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921), H. RYDER 271 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) graded "about" EF 40; (11) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 331 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (12) B.M. MEHL 114th Sale 9 (1951); (13) L.G. LAHRMAN 53 (A. KOSOFF, 1963).

VF grades: (14) D.S. WILSON 992 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (15) DR. G.P. FRENCH 353 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (16) F.R. ALVORD 47 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (17) W.W. NEIL 2203 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (18) C.M. WILLIAMS 684 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 25; (19) NN 56th Sale 418 (1962) VF 20; (20) E. SEARS 2-1-1905 appearing again as NN 59th Sale 1117 (1967) VF 20; (21) L. MERKIN 99 (3/1968); (22) J. PETERS 1681 (ANA, 1973).

The most common observation made by the cataloguers is the reverse die sinking, which produces a corresponding obverse central weakness. Of all the letters forming HALF CENT, the C seems to be least affected by the die sinking. The crack through the final T in STATES, which Gilbert described as "slight", is sometimes found to be "heavy" as in the Fahrman coin and the NN 56th sale coins. Granularity is fairly common, as seen in the Hellyer Ryder, Fahrman, Markham (3/1969) and NN 56 (1962) coins. The swollen area before the face is also described, as mentioned by Roger S. Cohen, but it does not appear to be common.

The only possibly uncirculated specimen that is pictured in the catalogues is the Brobston-Miles example, where HALF CENT is not visible; ~~The sample~~ Bs and one is startled to think that it is seriously considered as AU or UNC. About all that one can hope for ~~of~~ is an example where HALF CENT "can be made out" (Zeta Markham, 3/1969, lot 594).

The weights for this variety sometimes vary slightly from the 84 grain standard. The Alvord coin is 85 grains.

1795 G-5, CMM 6a (thin planchet)

Uncirculated grades: (1) W.F. GABLE 1375 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1914); (2) DR. G.P. FRENCH 354 (US COIN CO., 1917); (3) F.R. ALVORD 48 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), ANDERSON-DUPONT 1049 (STACK'S, 1954); (4) T.L. ELDER 2152 (4-11-1925); (5) W.C. ATWATER 126 (B.M. MEHL, 1946).

AU grades: (6) S.W. FREEMAN 1039 (KREISBERG and SCHULMAN, 1958); (7) C.M. WILLIAMS 685 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) AU 50;

EF grades: (8) R.B. WINSOR 1011 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (9) G.M. PARSONS 1943 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (10) A.W. JACKMAN 860 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (11) F.R. ALVORD 1051 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); L. MERKIN 514 (10/1972); (12) T.L. ELDER 2153 (4-11-1925); (13) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 464 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (14) W.W. NEIL 2204 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (15) F. BALDENHOFER 77 (STACK'S, 1955); (16) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) appearing again as lot 6 in Stack's sale of March, 1972; (17) J. BROBSTON, second sample (STACK'S, 1963); (18) GEN. M.S. NEWTON 5 (RARCOA, 1970); (19) HATHAWAY & BOWERS GAL., 7/1970; (20) NN-MBS 38 (3-27-1973) "nearly" EF40; (21) H.C. KINGMAN 4 (STACK'S, 1965).

VF grades: (22) and (23) F.R ALVORD 49 and 50 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (24) J. BROBSTON, a third sample (STACK'S, 1963); (25) L.G. LAHRMAN 54 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) VF25; (26) L. MERKIN 93 (3/1967) VF30.

95 G-5 then

~~(21) H.C. KRUGMAN 4 (STACK'S, 1945)~~

VF grades including (22) and (23) E.R. ALVORD 49 and 50 (1924); (24) J. BROBSTON, another example, (1963); (25) L.G. LAHRMAN 84 (1963) VF 25; and (26) L. MELKIN 93 (3/1967) VF 30.

Of the 39 examples of this variety that I recorded, exactly one-third were said to be overstruck on TAL tokens. Surfaces include "some proof" (Atwater), "glossy" (Brobston) and "matte" (NN-MBS 1973). Most planchets are satisfactory, but granularity and roughness are encountered. Some weak impressions are found, especially in the area below the bust, at 95 of the date, ~~and border~~ and at the border below the date and to the left (Alvord 48, Newton, Robb and Jackson). Off-center strikes are also met.

Weights vary considerably from the 84 grain standard. The uncirculated Alvord and the EF Winsor weigh 80 grains. All the other pieces, Elder said of the Dr Valentine specimen: "The most fine I have ever met with." The exact weight was not given.

~~1945 G-5, CMM-61 (thick planchet)~~

1795 G-5, CMM-6b (thick planchet)

~~I found~~ I found this variety offered three times:

(1) R.B. WINSOR 1010 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895) VF.
(2) NN 54th Sale 1623 (1960) EF 40.
(3) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) F12.

OBVIOUSLY A CMM #5A

The Winsor specimen weighed 121 1/2 grains and the reverse die was "cracked across." The NN 54th Sale staple was overstruck on an off-center 1795 large cent (S-78), the third such overstrike known.

Roger S. Cohen, Jr., who discovered this variety, writing in ~~the~~ Penny-Wise, November 15, 1973, indicates the nine staples are known to him: 2 VF, 1F, 3VG, 2 G and 1 FR.

1795 G-6, CHM-5a (thin planchet)

~~Uncirculated grades~~

Uncirculated grades: (1) S.H. McVITTY 5 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (2) C.M. WILLIAMS 686 (NUMIS. GAL. 1950).

AU grades: (3) H.C. MILLER 1031 (T.L. ELDER, 1917).

EF grades: (4) A.C. ZABRISKIE 902 (H. CHAPMAN, 1909) cleaned; (5) F.R. ALVORD 52 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (6) J. BROBSTON, (STACK'S, 1963); R.L. TOLLETT 2 (STACK'S, 1971); (7) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 776 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) "about" EF; (8) NN-MBS 38 (3-27-73) "nearly" EF 40 ~~[illegible]~~.

~~VF grades: H. RYDER 272 (NN 44, 1954~~

VF grades: (9) J. TEN EYCK 995 (B.M. MEHL, 1922); (10) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 465 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (11) H. RYDER 272 (NN 44, 1954), ex stock of WAYTE RAYMOND.

Some examples are sharp, as the Brobston coin and even the Dr Valentine coin despite the reverse die break. On the other ~~[illegible]~~ hand, sometimes the reverse center is described as weak (N. SINGLETON 813, T.L. ELDER 1922, G-VG), and sometimes both ~~[illegible]~~ centers are said to be weak (L. MERKIN 32, 9/1968). In the last mentioned Merkin sale, and in the Brobston sale, it was said that this variety is normally weak.

Granularity is sometimes seen.

The die breaks are not accurately described, except for the Alvord coin where it is said to be "pronounced from

TA across width to R", which must be the "advanced stage" that is sometimes mentioned by the cataloguers, since it is greater than the break described by Gilbert or in Empire.

Colors ~~are~~ range from light brown, or olive with orange red ~~(C 11 Ba 6 Ity)~~ (Alvord, Ba Vitty) to darker browns. Block samples are known.

1795 G-6, CHM-5b (thick planchet)

No pretender to most state was offered.

AU grades: (1) A. KOSOFF 145 (ANA 1953); H. RYDER 273 (NN 44, 1954); (2) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), W. VAN RODEN 106 (STACK'S, 1968).

EF grades: (3) C. MORRIS 867 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1905); (4) G.M. PARSONS 1542 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (5) J.H. MANNING 5 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (6) T.L. ELDER 2313 (5-19-23); (7) R.L. MILES 6 (STACK'S, 1969).

VF grades: (8) A.C. ZABRISKIE 901 (H. CHAPMAN, 1908); (9) H.O. GRANBERG 537 (B.M. MEHL, 1919).

NO - IT WAS DOUBLE STRUCK WITH WEAK DIES

Over-strikes, probably on a large coil, include the Mehl coin and also A.R. TURINI 191 (STACK'S, 1972) and L. MERRIN 33 (9/1968), which weighs just under 123 grains. The above coin is 106 grains.

NO MENTION OF ANY OVERSTRIKE USABLE

Some specimens are sharply struck (Brobston and Morris). Others, like Hallger Ryder, are weak. The Ryder catalogue attributes the weakness around the date, the center reverse and some leaves to ~~the~~ worn dies. Other catalogueers attribute the weak reverse to die sinking (Parsons and ~~the~~ ANDERSON-DUPONT 1048, STACK'S 1954)

Some of the planchets are dark ~~or~~ or rough (Ryder; L. Merrin 33, 9/1968). Other colors reported are from tan to chocolate

1795 G-7, CHM-3

I have ~~two~~ seven recorded sales for this variety.

(1) The HASELTINE Sale 846 (BANGS & CO, 1880) with EF-AU range; (2) F.R. ALVORD 54 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), DR. D.W. VALENTINE 466 (T.L. ELDER, 1927) Fair; (3) T.L. ELDER 337 (4/1925) G; (4) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1046 (STACK'S, 1954) almost EF; (5) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) ~~[illegible]~~ AU; (6) L. MERKIN 102 (3/1968) VF; (7) L. MERKIN 34 (9/1968) almost VG.

The Stack's catalogues say that the Brobston coin is the finest known, followed by the Anderson-Dupont. The reverse center tends to be weak.

1795 6-8, CMM 2-b

Six entries for this variety

(1) F.R. ALVORD 55 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), H. RYDER 270 (NN 44, 1954); (2) B.M. MEHL 1264 (82 Mehl, 1930); (3) B.E. ROACH 3251 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (4) W.W. NEIL 2205 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (5) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1045 (STACK'S, 1954); (6) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963).

ex Commodore W.C. Eaton

The F.R. ALVORD - HILLYER RYDER coin is MS 60. The BELDEN E. ROACH coin was graded AU. The BROBSTON coin is graded VF. The ANDERSON-DUPONT, VF over F. The WILL W. NEIL, "about" F. The Mehl 1264 VG-5

There is a chance that the NEIL and BROBSTON coins are one and the same. The Ryder catalogue states that after the Ryder MS 60 "the other five known specimens of this variety are in conditions AU-50, Fine-15 (2), Fine-12 and Very Good-7, * * * and are in the Breen, (Neil) Brobston, Warfield (2), and (Baggenheimer) Schonwalter collections."

Reverse die sinking cracks, of course, as in 6-3, CMM-2a, and weaning at MER to border. All heads are plumed as granular (Ryder) and at least one is clipped (Anderson-Dupont)

1796 G-1, CAM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1053 (STACK'S, 1954) MS65, believed to be the McCOY-LEVICK-ZANONI-MILLER-NEWCOMB-GREEN coin; (2) H. RYDER 274 (NN 44, 1954) MS 60, ex ELLSWORTH collection, 1922, believed to come from G.M. KLEIN collection (W.E. WOODWARD, MAY, 1888); (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) described as equal to Anderson-Dupont and superior to Ryder.

AU grades: (4) T.L. ELDER 99 (13th Sale 1907) probably AU; (5) A-MARK catalogue December, 1972.

EF grades: (6) W.B. GUY 909 (H. CHAPMAN, 1911); (7) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 335 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (8) Dr. C.A. ALLENBURGER 402 (B.M. MEHL, 1948), and B.M. MEHL 12 (114th Sale, 1951); (9) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 825 (1966) "virtually" EF.

VF grades: (10) R.B. WINSOR 1013 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1885); (11) ~~[illegible]~~. G.H. EARLE 3610 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912) graded F, and DR. D.W. VALENTINE 467 (T.L. ELDER, 1927) as VF; (12) B.E. ROACH 3253 (B.M. MEHL, 1944), W.W. NEIL 2206 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) graded VF over G-F in both sales; (13) T.J. CLARKE 450 (A. KOSOFF 1956) ex B.H. COLLINS-WM. F. DUNHAM from LINCOLN of LONDON in 1890; (14) METRO. N.Y. NUM. CONV. 166 (STACK'S, 1962); (15) R.E. COX 166 (STACK'S, 1962) ex Collins; (16) "MILLION DOLLAR AUCTION" 2A (FED. BRAND, 1963).

These specimens range from MS 65 (Anderson-Dugan) to "not quite G-3" (M.A. STICKNEY 1686, H. CHAPMAN 1907) appearing again in NN 59th Sale 1119 (1967). The Brabston coin is described as having a "full proof surface." Colors have a similar range from ~~light brown with traces of red~~ faded mint red (Brabston) to black (Alford). Off-center strikes are known, as are specimens with clipped (~~flans~~ planchets).

Boldly impressed coins are mentioned, as are strikes with weak ~~secondary centers~~ borders (Ryder) or weak reverse centers (Stickney, R.T. HERDEGEN 161 Schulman Coin & Mint, 1973).

(2) H.C. MILLER 1032 (T.L. ELDER, 1917);

1796 G-2, CAM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B. WINSOR 1012 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (3) G.H. EARLE 3609 (H.C. CHAPMAN, 1912) of Ellsworth, and W.C. ATWATER 129 (B.M. MEHL 108th Sale, 1946); (4) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1054 (STACK'S, 1954) MS 65, said to be equal to the ELIASBERG and SHOWERS ~~coin~~ coin.

VF grades: (5) L. MERKIN 596 (3/1969) of CARL WURTZBACH, VIRGIL BRAND, DR. WILLIAM SHELDON, HENRY CHAPMAN

+ VIRGIL BRAND,

F grades: (6) A. KOSOFF 1454 (ANA 1953) graded VF but considered F in the Hallgren Ryder catalogue; (7) H. RYDER 275 (HN 44, 1954) F 15, "fourth worst example of rank"; of DAVID PROSKEY; (8) DAVIS-GRAVES 87 (STACK'S, 1954) graded F over VG; (9) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) and in CENTURY Sale 61 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (10) H.C. KINGMAN 5 (STACK'S, 1967) and R.L. MILES 8 (STACK'S, 1969).

VG grades: (11) P. MOUGEY 291 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (12) C.M. WILLIAMS 689 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950).

Planchets come pitted and porous (Kingman-Miles; Brobston). Sometimes the obverse border is not struck up at the right (Dupont), and sometimes the reverse center is weak from die sinking (Ryder). Some surfaces are cellar proof or almost proof (Winsor, Earle, Miller, Atwater). Color ranges from light olive with traces of red on both sides (Earle) to dark brown (Ryder). The Ryder coin is illustrated in the Hallgren plate.

1797 G-1, CMM.3-b

The lettered edge variety of this year was first described in the LEVITT, STREBEIGH & CO catalogue of the JOSEPH J. MICKLEY ~~co~~ collection, the property of W. ELLIOT WOODWARD, Octobr 28, 1867, where it was thought to be "of the highest rarity, probably unique" (lot 2083). ~~[illegible]~~ A good many must have come to light fairly soon, because the 16th edition of Scott's Standard Catalogue No 5 (1890) reflects a stock of these lettered edge coins in Fair and Good, but not higher.

EF grades: (1) NN 61 Sale 114 (1970).

VF grades: (2) W. NEWCOMBER 3404 (Sale ?). The NN 61st Sale catalogue wonders if this is the same coin once offered by SIDNEY SMITH. An apparently similar grade coin was offered by MULFORD B. SIMONS, JR (PENN VALLEY) in Coin World, 10-10-73, and may be the same; (3) G.H HALL 105 (STACK'S, 1945); (4) NN 56 Sale 420 (1962) VF 25 "when struck up"; (5) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) offered again as L. MERKIN 597 (3/1969); (6) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 779 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) VF 20; (7) ALTO COLL. 516 (STACK'S, 1970); (8) F.H. MASTERS 4 (RARCOA, 1971)

F grades: (9) F.R. ALVORD 58 (SH CHAPMAN 1924); (10) M.F. HIGGY 1116 (NUMIS. GAL., 1943) F over VG; (11) W.W. NEIL 2207 (B.M MEHL, 1947) F over VF;

97 G-1

(12) F.W. GEISS 281 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) F over VG; (13) C.M. WILLIAMS 690 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (14) B.M. MEHL 13 (114th Sale, 1951); (15) H. RYDER 276 (NN 44, 1954) about F 12; (16) H. RYDER 277 (NN 44, 1954) not quite F 12; (17) L.G. LAHRMAN 55 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (18) J. BROBSTON, ~~[illegible]~~, (STACK'S, 1963); (19) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 826 (1966); (20) L. MERKIN 36 (9/1968); (21) ~~[illegible]~~ A. CHAMPA 590 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1972) F over G-VG;

of David Proskey and D.O. Hughes 42 (Stack's, 1948), as VG-

VG grades: ~~[illegible]~~ (22) T.L. ELDER 210 (2-25-1909); (23) DR. G.P. FRENCH 355 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (24) B.E. ROACH 3256 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); ~~(25) D.O. HUGHES 42 (STACK'S, 1948)~~; (25) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1056 (STACK'S, 1954); (26) B.M. MEHL 8 (10-25-1955); (27) E. BOSTIC 8 (STACK'S, 1956); (28) "MILLION DOLLAR AUCTION" 3 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (29) CENTURY SALE 63 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (30) L. MERKIN 95 (3/1967); (31) A. SHUFORD 135 (A. KOSOFF, 1968)

G grades: (32) J.J. MICKLEY 2083 (LEVITT, ~~STREBEIGH~~, STREBEIGH & Co., 1867); (33) J.C. RANDALL 519 (T. BIRCH & SON, 1868); (34) P. GSCHWEND 696 (T.L. ELDER, 1908); (35) R.E. BROWN 464 (T.L. ELDER, 1918); (36) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 468 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (37) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 338 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (38) DONLON Sale 1643 (A. KOSOFF, 1956).

97 G-1

~~This variety is notorious for its poor examples.~~

This is one of the varieties that are notorious for their poor specimens. "Not a very prepossessing or handsome coin," said B. Max Mehl, and he was trying to make a sale.

There is a frequent weakness that is seen at the ~~top of the coin, it is on the both obverse and reverse,~~ right side of the coin, on the top, both obverse and reverse (Brobston-Merkin 3/1969, Anderson-Dupont, Masters, Ryder and Kreisberg to Schulman). The Merkin catalogue for March, 1969, attributes this to an out-of-plane alignment of the dies. The date is sometimes bolder than the over-all grade of the coin, as in B.M. MEHL 8 (10-25-55), H.O. GRANBERG 540 (B.M. MEHL, 1919), and T.L. ELDER 2711 (6/1932).

The planchets are often rough, ~~[illegible]~~ porous and pitted. One example is on an unusually thin flan, weight not given (L. MERKIN 95, March, 1967), which ~~It was struck with a thick flan~~ is believed to be a re-processed, mis-struck large cent, as are a number ~~of the thick flan~~ other specimens (ALVORD 60, G SCHWEND 696, LAHRMAN 55, ~~and~~ NN 61 Lot 114, and BROBSTON) ~~[illegible]~~ The Brobston example is a ~~identified~~ 1798 large cent, identified as either S-160 or S-161, which ~~the~~ of course has emission sequence implications.

Despite the large number of sales, the fresh information is sparse. The MERKIN 95 (3/1967) is rare.

97-62

(45)

to represent an early die state because (1) the area from chin to border is bulged but not broken, and (2) there is no reverse crack. The progress of the die breaks may be difficult to trace because of the poor quality of these coins.

The weights, where given, show a broad range from the NN 61 Feb 114 (EF-40 to 45), which is 84.20 grains, to the Brobston-Sherman (3/1969) 597 (VF), which is either 96.5 or 96.1. The colors are not remarkable; shades of brown, ~~dark~~ dark gray, and dark steel. One is black (Mag. R.L. Lambert 687, S.H. Chapman, 1910). Off-center strikes are common. None are described as lustrous. Possibly the poor quality flans discouraged early collectors from adding them to their cabinets.

The RYDER-BROBSTON coin is illustrated in the Gilbert plate

1797 G-2, CAM-3a

EF grades (1) M.A. STICKNEY 1687? (H. CHAPMAN, 1907), J. S. JENKS 6246 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921). "Very small, light dent before chin." R.T. DAVIS 3 (STACK'S, 1968) may be the same coin since it is said to have a tiny neck before the chin, and is also EF; (2) H. RYDER 278 (NN 44, 1954), J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) graded EF 40 in both sales.

but the Davis photo is not good enough to make a positive identification.

VF grades: (3) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1055 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 25; (4) HATHAWAY & BOWERS (3/1970); (5) QUALITY SALES CORP. 12 (3/1972).

F grades (6) L. MERKIN 96 (3/1967) F 15.

VG grades (7) F.R. ALVORD 62 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) F.R. ALVORD 63 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924)

Significantly, four of these coins are readily overstruck on large cents planchets — Alvord 63, Davis and Hathaway & Bowers, the four undetermined and Anderson-Dupont on a 1798 S-164.

Porosity is common. The colors are shades of brown, ~~[illegible]~~ steel and blackish. Off-center impressions occur.

1797 CHM-3c (grooved edge)

Five offerings:

(1) M.A. STICKNEY 1688 (H. CHAPMAN, 1907). Fair. "Bad scratch on top of head."

(2) J.S. JENKS 6245 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921). G. "Struck low, so milling is off on lower edge."

(3) D.O. HUGHES 43 (STACK'S, 1948). Fair to G. "Milled edge variety. Was overstruck but cannot decypher. Sharp."

(4) L. MERKIN 37 (9/1968) F. Finest known "very slightly exceeding the Jenks-Hirsch piece."

(5) R.S. COHEN, JR. (FPL No 1) 1972. Fair 3. "Only 8 specimens known to me."

1797 G-3, CHA-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1944 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890) and, from description, probably appeared again as J. G. MILLS 1410 (H. CHAPMAN, ~~1907~~ 1904); (2) P. MOUGEY 292 (T. L. ELDER, 1910), H. RYDER 280 (NN 44, 1954) where it was graded "about" AU55; (3) G. E. CHATILLON 1640 (B. M. MEHL, 1938).

AU grades: In addition to Mougey cos, above, (4) HASELTINE Sale 852 (BANGS & CO., 1880); (5) W. RAYMOND II (5/1915).

EF grades: (6) R. B WINSOR 1014 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (7) W. B. HALE 261 (B. M. MEHL, 1939); (8) M. A. HOLMES 1287 (STACK'S, 1960); (9) S. W. WOLFSON 4 (STACK'S, 1963); (10) R. L. MILES 10 (STACK'S, 1969); (11) BOWERS & RUDDY REVIEW No. 18 (1973).

VF grades: (12) ~~L. G. LAHRMAN 56~~ DR. G. P. FRENCH 356 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917) as F, L. G. ~~LARM~~ LAHRMAN 56 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (13) F. R. ALVORD 65 (S. H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (14) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1063 (STACK'S, 1954); (15) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (16) GRANT-PIERCE 5 (STACK'S, 1965); (17) JESS PETERS 1682 (ANA, 1973)

F grades: (18) F. R. ALVORD 64 (S. H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (19) DR. D W VALENTINE 472 (T. L. ELDER, 1927); (20) C. M. WILLIAMS 691 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (21) L. MERKIN 38 (9/1968); (22) L. MERKIN 39 (9/1968).

97 G-3

Both the MOUGEY and CHATILLON coins are described as being "medium olive" in color, and uncirculated. Possibly they are one and the same. The CLENEAY-HILLS specimen is described as light brown with traces of red.

~~Four~~ Three coins are said to be overstruck on TAL tokens (WOLFSON, BOWERS & RUDDY and ALVORD 65). A fourth, on a thick flan weighing 98.4 grains, is said to be struck either on a large cent or TAL token.

Some of the coins are "poorly struck up," in the words of the Anderson-Dupont Catalogue. The Dr French-Fahrman specimen was said by Kosoff to be "poorly struck on a tired old planchet." Other examples have sharply struck, and have a broad border. Porosity and corrosion are sometimes present, as usual.

No new die breaks are reported, only the crack on UNITED. The Dr George P. French Sale of December 5, 1917 noted an important characteristic: "A weakness at end of LIBERTY and on corresponding part of reverse, peculiar to the variety." This weakness is seen so often that it is surprising not to find it mentioned ~~in the catalogue~~ more often.

COMM #1

The MOUGEY-RYDER obverse is illustrated in Gilbert.

1797 G-4, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) C.I. BUSHNELL 2769 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1882), A.W. JACKMAN 862 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (2) H.P. SMITH 1195 (CHAPMAN BROS, 1906); (3) M.A. STICKNEY 1690 (H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (4) H.C. MILLER 1633 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (5) B.E. ROACH 3254 (B.M. MEHL, 1974); (6) B.M. MEHL 14 (114th Ab, 1951); (7) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1058 (STACK'S, 1954); (8) ~~[illegible]~~ "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 781 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969).

AU grades: (9) P. GSCHWEND 694 (T.L. ELDER, 1908); (10) T.L. ELDER 2155 (4-11-1925); (11) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (12) S.W. WOLFSON 5 (STACK'S, 1963); (13) R.L. MILES 11 (STACK'S, 1969); (14) A.R. TURINI ~~[illegible]~~ 195 (STACK'S, 1972); (15) "TERRELL" COLL. 2 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1973).

EF grades: (16) T.L. ELDER 208 (2-25-1909); (17) B.M. MEHL 156 (87th Ab, 1933); (18) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), (19) ANA 1971 CONV. SALE 502 (STACK'S); (20) ROBERT MARKS 118 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1972); (21) A-MARK (DEC., 1972); (22) R.T. HERDEGEN 162 (SCHULMAN, 1973). ~~[illegible] NEWCOMBER EF40~~

VF grades: ~~(23) F.R. ALVORD 68 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924)~~; (23) G.H. EARLE 3612 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (24) F.R. ALVORD 68 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (25) C.H. WILLIAMS 691A (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 25; (26) A. SHUFORD 137 (A. KOSOFF, 1968); (27) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD

H. RYDER 279 (Ab 44, 1954) F12;

97 G-4

(51)

103 (L. MERKIN, 1968); (28) L. MERKIN 40 (9/1968).

There are numerous overstrikes on TAL tokens. Two of the Brabston coins are identified as being on 1794 tokens, and the other on an unidentified TAL. The Harbourn 79 (6/1968) is on a 1795 TAL token. The Anderson-Dupont and Shuford coins are also on unidentified TAL's. One specimen ~~is reported to have been struck~~ is reportedly struck on a 1795 half cent (W.B. GUY 911, H. CHAPMAN, 1911). On at least one example, the undertype was not decipherable (B.M. MEHL 14, 114th Sale, 1951).

Colors run the usual gamut from light brown with traces of red, to dark brown. Once again, a "jet black" example can be found (T.L. ELDER 208, Feb. 25, 1909).

It is curious that three coins show a reverse weakness, or die sinking, at 1CA (the STICKNEY and ELDER 208 coins, referred to above, and C.E. GILHOUSEN 4, SUPERIOR GAL., OCT., 1973). Sometimes, the borders are reported not fully struck up, or partly weak (STICKNEY, ROACH). There are also reports of a weak reverse center (H.P. SMITH) and die sinking at Cap and throat (EARLE 3613).

In a coin with so many die breaks as this variety has, it may hardly be worth

197 6-4

repeating another. Nevertheless, the "TERRELL" adds the following: ~~[illegible]~~ "Another minute due break extends upward and to the right a short distance and hangs at the top of the first S in STATES."

1800

The 1800 half cent was offered in uncirculated condition a surprisingly good many times. A dozen representative samples are: (1) T. CLENEAY 1945 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890), J.G. MILLS 1412 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1904), A.W. JACKMAN 863 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (2) L.G. PARMALEE 784 (BANGS & CO., 1890); (3) R.B. LEEDS 996 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906) appearing again as NN 59th sale 1121 (1967); (4) P. MOUGEY 293 (T.L. ELDER, 1910) again in B.M. MEHL 94th sale 264 (1939); (5) E. GILBERT 66 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (6) G.H. EARLE 3614 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (7) F.R. ALVORD 73 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1065 (STACK'S, 1954) MS 65; (9) H. RYDER 281 (NN 44th sale, 1954); (10) M.A. HOLMES 1188 (STACK'S, 1960); (11) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (12) R.L. MILES, JR. 12 (STACK'S, 1969)

Uncirculated specimens have also appeared in the following sales, among others: W. VAN ROSEN (1968); G.O. WALTON (1963); TERRELL (1973); C. JAY (1967); G.F. SCANLON (1973); S.W. FREEMAN (1958); H.P. SMITH (5/1906); J.D. SWEYD (1963); R.E. COX (STACK'S, 1962); W.H. WOODIN (1911); F. BALDENHOFER (1955); G.M. PARSONS (1914); B.E. ROACH (1944); DR. J.H. HENDERSON (1921); J.N.T. LEVICK (1895); W.E. WOODWARD (1867); J.C. RANDALL (1868); R.B. WINSOR (1855); R.A. ARNEL (1967); D.S. WILSON (1907); HELFENSTEIN-JUDD (1968); DR. G.P. FRENCH (1917); MAJOR R. LAMBERT (1910).

Some specimens show small run breaks or crumbling over LIB (Ryder, Anderson-Dupont, Merkin 104 (3/1960) and Zieda). The example sold in the NN 56th Sale (1962), lot 421, had run breaks from LIB down to the level of the hair knot. In addition, the same coin exhibits a reverse break between E and C of CENT. There are two other breaks that are mentioned, but these remain questionable until confirmed: (1) PROF. M.S. READ 1798 (T.L. ELDER, 1921) graded G, break said to be at the curl, near the numeral 1; and (2) U.S. COIN CO. Sale of 6-20-1917, lot 98, graded EF but "bronzed," the break said to be at the wreath.

Sometimes, double impressions may be found (Hellyer Ryder) and sometimes the R in LIBERTY is ~~is~~ partly "unfinished" or filled (the Brabston VF example). Sharpness varies from coin to coin.

Most of the catalogue descriptions emphasize color. The Milton A. Holmes coin is described as "fully a blazing mint red." Colors range all the way down to coal-black. The Chapmans said that the CLENEAY-MILLS-JACKMAN coin was the finest they knew of. This may be different today in view of the large number of uncirculated specimens known. The NN 54th Sale catalogue mentions that about 40 coins were found in the so-called "Boston-hoard" in the early 1930's, and it adds that "most of them were spotty or otherwise not too desirable."

1802 G-1, CHM-2

There appear to be no uncirculated specimens of this variety although, at one time, two coins tried to pass as such: (1) P. MOUGEY 294 (T.L. ELDER, 1910) was called uncirculated then, but when it reappeared as A.W. JACKMAN 866 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918) it was graded EF; (2) L.G. PARMALEE 753 (BANGS & Co, 1890) was graded EF, but when it reappeared as E.W. ROPES 428 (BANGS & Co., 1893) it was inexplicably graded uncirculated. The pedigree of the ROPES coin is from marginal notes in the ANS copy of the ROPES sale.

Octa EF grades: (3) M.A. HOLMES 1290 (STACK'S, 1960); (4) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), R.L. MILES 13 (STACK'S, 1969).

VF grades: (5) MILLER COLL., 508 (HESSLEIN, 4-12-1916), H. RYDER 283 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) VF 25; (6) DR. G.P. FRENCH 358 (U.S. COIN Co., 1917), L.G. LAHRMAN 61 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) VF 20, said then to be ex Dr French and T.J. CLARKE; (7) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 344 (NUMIS. GAL., ~~1945~~ 1945); (8) C.M. WILLIAMS 693 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (9) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1067 (STACK'S, 1954); (10) DAVIS-GRAVES 90 (STACK'S, 1954); (11) NN 57th Sale 4 (1963); (12) S.W. WOLFSON 7 (STACK'S, 1963); (13) NN 61st Sale 4 (1970); (14) A-MARK (12/1972); (15) BOWERS and RUDDY, RARE COIN REVIEW No. 18 (1973).

F grades: Representative examples include (16) T. CLENEAY 1946 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890); (17) H.P. SMITH DUP. SALE 584 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1123 (1967);

(18) J. D. SWEYD 70 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) F 15; (19) CENTURY SALE 66 (PARAMOUNT, 1965); (20) C. R. BARTLETT 88 (STACK'S, 1966).

The catalogues did not pay much attention to a description of the die breaks, except that here and there "early state" will be referred to (RYDER, ANDERSON-DUPONT), without further specification.

Overstrikes are noted. SWEYD and ANDERSON-DUPONT are on a large cent flans and ALVORD 78 is struck in some unidentified planchet, ~~some also states the~~ and "ST of another coin" appears within the wreath.

A reverse center weakness is commonly described (WILLIAMS, DR. FRENCH, ANDERSON-DUPONT), but at least ~~one of the dates~~ one reverse was said to be stronger than the obverse (L. MERKIN, 105, Sale of March, 1968). In the DAVIS-GRAVES staple, Y of LIBERTY was not struck up. The existence of rusted dies shows, occasionally (ALVORD 79). ~~The usual coin is not Proof~~

Despite this variety's reputation for poor looking specimens, they are well-struck, handsome pieces (HOLMES, RYDER, BROBSTON-MILES, MOUGEY-JACKMAN and PARMALEE-ROPES). Once again, jet-black staples are found: CLENEAY and CENTURY.

1802 G-2, CMM-1

The discovery piece is W.B. GUY 915 (H. CHAPMAN, 1911) graded VG. It appears again as H. RYDER 282 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) now graded F12 and said to be struck on a poor flan and mishandled.

I found six other coins: (1) F.R. ALVORD 80 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), W.W. NEIL 2213 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1960), CENTURY SALE 67 (PARAMOUNT, 1967) graded VG with Alvord sale and F in the Brobston sale; (2) J.C. MORGENTHAU 278th Sale 570 (1932) "very fair"; (3) J.C. MORGENTHAU 368th Sale 434 (1936) VG; (4) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1066 (STACK'S, 1954) F12; (5) ANA 1965 Sale 2 (AL. C. OVERTON), graded G-VG over Fair; (6) R.S. COHEN, JR FPL No 1 (1972) G-6.

The Anderson-Dupont was said to duplicate the Ryder coin in sharpness, color, weakness of striking and mishandling. Some examples of this variety are clearly overstruck (ALVORD 80 - NEIL - BROBSTON - CENTURY and COHEN).

The Overton catalogue notes "diagnostic" die break from wreath to E in UNITED. This is the only reference I found to a die break. If this break really exists, it may be the same as on the 1800 U.S. Cent G. Lot 98, Sale of June 20, 1917 where a reverse break of this die was said to read ~~"on the wreath"~~ "on wreath." This is speculative.

This variety is rare, but not good-looking, it seems.

5-10-74

Dear Roger:

These are copies of the continuation pages (1803-1808) that ~~as~~ I sent to Warren Zippe for my "catalogue sales" article.

Sincerely,

Walt Pfeffer

1803 G-1, CMM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) DR. G.P. FRENCH 359 (U.S. COIN CO, 1917); (2) F.R. ALVORD 81 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (3) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1069 (STACK'S, 1954); (4) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (5) L. MERKIN 106 (3/1968).

EF grades: (6) C.M. WILLIAMS 695 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) EF 40.

VF grades: (7) A.R. TURINI 201 (STACK'S, 1972); (8) STACK'S 1046 (JAN.-FEB. 1974 sale) ex R.S. COHEN, JR. 1972)

F grades: (9) F. BALDENHOFER 84 (STACK'S, 1955); (10) L. MERKIN 43 (9/1968); (11) COINS + CURRENCY, INC. 1422 (5/1970).

Merkin 106 was said to be the finest known, and the catalogue added that one other MS specimen was known, but it was scratched. The Brobston catalogue also described its specimen as "one of the finest, if not the finest."

It is evident that weak strikes are a problem with this variety. The uncirculated Merkin 106 is not fully struck up, and the obverse of the Anderson-Dupont coin, also uncirculated, is weak. In addition, weakness was described in the TURINI coin (central obverse).

David Proskey in the Coin Collector's Journal for 1880, p. 183, said of this obverse die: "Same obverse as that of the 1802 half cent, but all traces of the 2 and the surrounding 0 have been removed." This may be the basis for the assertion of some catalogues that there are 1803 over 2 overstrikes (S.H. CHAPMAN sale of October, 1919, lot 1185; and T.L. ELDER sale of October, 1907, lot 101 and sale of December, 1906, lot 169).

1803 G-2, CMM-1

The early catalogues made very little effort to differentiate the varieties of 1803. Where descriptions are given, they almost always lack the detail necessary for attribution. As a result, most of the higher grade coins appearing in the early sales, being unattributable, must be ignored.

Uncirculated grades: (1) T.L. ELDER 168 (12-6-06), downgraded to AU50 in NN 59th Sale 1124 (1967); (2) H.C. MILLER 1036 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (3) U.S. COIN CO. 481 (2-6-1918); (4) F.R. ALVORD 83 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (5) S.H. McVITTY 11 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (6) W.B. HALE 266 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (7) W.C. ATWATER 134 (B.M. MEHL, 1946); (8) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1070 (STACK'S, 1954); (9) 1955 MANA Conv. Sale 30 (ASSOC. COIN AUCTION) "just about" MS 60; (10) T.J. CLARKE 452 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (11) METRO. N.Y. NUMIS. CONV. 173 (STACK'S, 1962); (12) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (13) "MILLION DOLLAR AUCTION" 4 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (14) L. MERKIN 107 (3/1968); (15) R.L. MILES, JR. 14 (STACK'S, 1969); (16) G.V. NELSON 3 (STACK'S, 2-5-71)

AU grades: (17) ANDERSON GAL. 397 (5-26-1919); (18) R.E. COX 173 (STACK'S, 1962); (19) NN 56th Sale 422 (1962).

EF grades: (21) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 482 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (22) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 483 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (23) L. MERKIN 44 (9/1968); (24) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 782 (HARMER ROOME, 1969); (25) ANA 1973 Sale 1690 (JESS PETERS, 1973)

The Merkin 107 catalogue described (in 1968) that coin as "one of possibly more uncirculated specimens."

Weak strikes often occur, as with the preceding variety. The Brobston coin was described in the catalogue as: "Flatly struck on the obverse and correspondingly on the reverse (practically

all known specimens are similarly struck)." The NN56 & Sale catalogue says of the example there offered: "softly struck at top of hair as usually seen on these." The Norman 107 catalogue relates the weakness to die breaks: "softly struck up in the centers as normal with the later die states of this variety." Not all specimens exhibit weakness, however.

With one or two exceptions, the cataloguers took little interest in die breaks, except to mention the existence of a reverse break. The progression or course of the break is not detailed. In the catalogue of the Dr. Charles L. Ruby Sale, Part I, (1974) it is noted under lot 227 that the cracked reverse is scarce.

In Stack's sale of the GEORGE V. NELSON coin, the obverse is said to be "slightly bulged." This is the only report of a bulge that I have for this variety, and I think that it is questionable because there are no other reports of a bulge, even though the same obverse die was used later (G-4, CMM-2 and G-1, CMM-4).

1803 G-3, CMM-3

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1947 (CHAPMAN BROS, 1890), appearing again as P. MOUGEY 295 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (2) R.B. WINSOR 1019 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895), A.W. JACKMAN 868 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (3) H.P. SMITH DUP. 586 (CHAPMAN BROS, 6/1906), NN 59th Sale 1125 (1967); (4) C.S. BEMENT 419 (H. CHAPMAN, 1916); (5) DR. G.P. FRENCH 361 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (6) T.L. ELDER 2315 (5/1923); (7) F.R. ALVORD 88 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), H. RYDER 284 (NN 44th Sale, 1967); (8) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1803 (STACK'S, 1954); (9) DAVIS-GRAVES 9 (STACK'S, 1954); (10) J. BRIBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (11) L. MERKIN 101 (3/1967); (12) W. VAN RODEN 113 (STACK'S, 1968). The HARLAN P. SMITH Duplicate, the ALVORD-RYDER, and the ANDERSON-DUPONT were graded MS 60.

AU grades: (13) J.S. JENKS 6251 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (14) L.G. LAHRMAN 62 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (15) L. MERKIN 602 (3/1969, auction); (16) NN 61st Sale 115 (1970) AU50.

EF grades: (17) T.L. ELDER 2716 (6/1932); (18) C.M. WILLIAMS 698 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) EF 40.

The BRIBSTON and FRENCH specimens were struck from perfect dies. There is no doubt that the reverse die was the first to crack, since it is found broken with obverse unbroken (VAN RODEN and NN 61st Sale). The H.P. SMITH Duplicate shows both dies cracked, as do many other specimens.

The obverse bulge over 18 may have preceded even the reverse break, since examples of this variety are sometimes seen to show the bulge, and no mention is made of any

die breaks (ALVORD 87 and JENKS). The terminal state of the die has the bulge broken out on 18 (ALVORD 92), with all the obverse and reverse breaks. The GILHOUSEN 5 (SUPERIOR, 1973) also refers to clash marks, and summarizes the ~~[illegible]~~ state as "bulged, clashed and cracked." Perfect die specimens are uncommon, as are examples where the bulge on 18 is broken out. F.R. ALVORD was so taken with the die states of this variety that his collection had seven examples, more than any other variety.

There is frequent mention of a weakness in the striking of the leaves at the top of the wreath. The MERKIN 101 catalogue says this was caused by the reverse break. In the BEMENT catalogue, Henry Chapman says the weakness is caused "as the metal had gone into the back of Liberty on obverse."

Porosity exists (the BROBSTON VF example; and also the VF RARCOA 1056 sold at the Florida Winter Numismatists Convention in 1973), but it is not frequent. The RARCOA coin is another example where the reverse is not fully struck up.

1803 G-4, CAM-2

AU grades: (1) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963).

VF grades: (2) F.R. ALVORD 93 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (3) COINS & CURRENCY, INC. 1421 (5/1970).

F grades: (4) COMM. W.C. EATON 1014 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (5) W.W. NEIL 2217 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (6) DR. C.W. GREEN 2587 (B.M. MEHL, 1949); (7) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1071 (STACK'S, 1954); (8) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), a second sample, appearing again in R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972), his second sample also, and downgraded to VG 8; (9) L. MERKIN 45 (9/1968); (10) R.S. COHEN JR., FPL No. 1 (1972) F 12, his first sample.

VG grades: (11) PROF. M.S. READ 1805 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (12) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 485 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (13) COMM. W.C. EATON 1013 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (14) DR. C.L. RUBY 229 (SUPERIOR 1974, Part I).

The Brobston AU, described as "Just a shade from Uncirculated," is said to be probably the finest known, and to be lustrous, proof-like, with iridescent steel and mint red. After that, the quality of the specimens falls sharply. Roger H. Cohen, Jr. described his VG 8 as "a very ugly coin but a very rare [reverse] die state." The Anderson-Dupont has a heavy rim break over STAT, as does the Brobston F coin. Obverse incusation marks are sometimes seen (Alvord 95).

One must consider the possibility that specimens from perfect dies are rarer than from broken dies.

1804 6-1, C&G-11

Uncirculated grades: (1) B. BLUESTONE 359 (2/1946) cleaned and burnished to resemble a proof. The Foster Harbourn September, 1968 catalogue mentions two undistinguished mint state examples.

AU grades: (2) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (3) "TERRELL" COLL 95 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973).

EF grades: (4) U.S COIN CO. 484 (2-6-1918); (5) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 486 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (6) C.M. WILLIAMS 701 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (7) J. BROBSTON, another example, retoned and bagged (STACK'S, 1963); (8) L. MERKIN 47, "almost" EF (9/1962); (9) L. MERKIN 603 (3/1969); (10) STACK'S 1109 (6-12-1970); (11) W.R.T. SMITH (1973) offered as "nearly" C.C."; (12) WINTER COLL. 1047 (STACK'S, Jan.-Feb. 1974), the Roger A. Gheen Jr. plate coin. 10th one known coin

VF grades: (13) L.C. GEHRING 997 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (14) F.R. ALVORD 96 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (15) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 347 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (16) D.O. HUGHES 63 (STACK'S, 1948), L.G. LAHRMAN 64 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) & D. PROSKEY; (17) F. BALDENHOFER 86 (STACK'S, 1955); (18) FED. BRAND 33 (7/1966) dull, probably lettering and leaves; (19) A. SHUFORD 141 (A. KOSOFF, 1968) VF25; (20) R.L. MILES, JR. 15 (STACK'S, 1969); (21) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 783 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (22) FLA. UNITED NUM. 1973 Conv. Sale 1057 (RARCOA).

F grades: (23) H. RYDER 290 (NN 44th Sale, 1954), ex L.H. LOW'S 173rd Sale, Sept. 12, 1913, but I cannot trace the lot number; (24) R.T. ~~HERDEGEN~~ HERDEGEN

165 (SCHULMAN, 1973)

George R. Ross described a "weak crack in field behind head" in certain specimens of this variety (The Numismatist, March, 1916, at page 113). This break is also reported in LESTER MERKIN'S catalogue for the March, 1969 sale, under lot number 603, where a faint trace of a obverse crack is noted. Since this variety is found with obverse both perfect and broken, it would seem that in G-2, CMM-13 (where the same obverse is used), the same break should always appear, if the striking of that variety followed G-1, or never appear, if the striking preceded G-1, unless there were intervening die marriages.

A reverse die buckling, causing central weakness, is often mentioned.

Lester Merkin's September, 1968 catalogue says that there are two weak state examples, followed by the Broadstar AU, and the "almost" EF then being offered. It adds that there are "only three others which will reach levels above VF-20 ***." The early reverse die state is there stated to be the stand of ~~the~~ buckling at LF.

The reverse die is easily recognized by the numerator, which leans to the right. This is a diagnostic feature, so we might call ~~this~~ the reverse, "the leaning numerator."

1804 G-2, CMM-13

Uncirculated grade: (1) R.B. WINSOR 1020 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (2) H.P. SMITH Dup. 587 (CHAPMAN BROS., 6/1906), NN 59th Sale 1129 (1967) MS65; (3) P. MOUGEY 296 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (4) G.H. EARLE 3623 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (5) M.N JACKSON 1402 (U.S. COIN CO., 5/1913) "bright red"; (6) U.S. COIN CO. 110 (11-25-1913); (7) DR. G.P. FRENCH 20 (U.S. COIN CO., 1915); (8) G.M. ANDRUS 118 (U.S. COIN CO., 1915); (9) DR. G.P. FRENCH 362 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (10) H.C. MILLER 1037 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (11) A.W. JACKMAN 869 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (12) J.S. JENKS 6252 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (13) F.R. KIMBALL 976 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (14) J.H. MANNING 14 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (15) T.L. ELDER 2316 (5-19-23); (16) F.R. ALVORD 97 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (17) T.R. ELDER 2720 (6/1932); (18) S.H. McVITTY 12 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (19) M.H. BOLENDER 251 (11/1938); (20) W.B. HALE 268 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (21) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 348 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (22) B. BLUESTONE 360 (2/1946); (23) DR. C.A. ALLENBURGER 553 (B.M. MEHL, 1948); (24) 1952 ANA Conv. Sale 490 (E. GANS et al.); (25) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1083 (STACK'S, 1954); (26) S.W. FREEMAN 1049 (KREISBERG + SCHULMAN, 1958); (27) M.A. HOLMES 1293 (STACK'S, 1960); (28) METRO. N.Y Conv. Sale 175 (STACK'S, 1962); (29) "MILLION DOLLAR AUCT." 5 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (30) G. PIERCE 10 (STACK'S, 1965); (31) L. MERKIN 105 (3/1967); (32) L. MERKIN 109 (3/1968); (33) L. MERKIN 81 (6/1968); (34) W. VAN RODEN 115 (STACK'S, 1968); (35) R.L. MILES, JR. 16 (STACK'S, 1969); (36)

04 G-2

"TERRELL" COLL. 96 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1973); (37) 1973 FLA. UNITED NUM. CONV. 1058 (RARCOA) ~~[illegible]~~ MS 60; (38) G. V. NELSON 4 (STACK'S, 1971); (39) 1973 GENA CONV. 98 (PINE TREE) cleaned; (40) WINTER COLL. 1048 (STACK'S, Jan.-Feb., 1974)

AU grades: (41) C.M. WILLIAMS 703 (NUMIS. GAL, 1950) AU 50, L.G. LAHRMAN 65 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) now graded AU55; (42) H. RYDER 289 (NN 44 & Sale, 1954) as Chapman, without further identification; (43) NN 52 & Sale 95 (1958); (44) L. MERKIN 48 (9/1968); (45) A-MARK catalogue, Dec., 1972); (46) 1973 ANA CONV. Sale 66 (JESS PETERS)

EF grades: (47) MAJ. W. B. WETMORE 697 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906); (48) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963)

VF grades: (49) NN 56 & Sale 427 (1962) VF 30; (50) DR. C.L. RUBY 237 (SUPERIOR, 1974, PART I) as C. FRENCH, May 2, 1952); (51) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), a second sample, double struck.

F grades: (52) DR. C.L. RUBY 236 (SUPERIOR, 1974, PART I) as C. KAPPEN, Feb. 28, 1946.

Uncirculated samples are quite common, but not with considerable redness. Uneven strikes have been noted, as the Merkin 48 (9/1968) and the Ruby 236. Sometimes the obverse serrations are not visible, as in the H.P. Smith Duplicate, even though it was graded MS 65 when sold in the NN 59 & Sale (1967). The sample sold in the NN 56 & Sale (1962) ~~[illegible]~~ was said to exhibit incusation marks below the chin.

In discussing the 1804 G-1, CAM-11 variety, I mentioned the fact that observations had been made of a faint, vertical crack behind the head, in several examples of that variety. Since 1804 G-2, CAM-11 used the same obverse die, it would seem, logically, that G-2 should either never show that break, or always show it, depending on whether the striking of G-2 preceded or followed G-1 (unless there were interrupted die marriages).

The RYDER, RUBY 237, MERKIN (3/1967) and MERKIN (3/1968) were all said to show this break. But the RUBY 236 and 1973 GENA sale coins were specifically said not to show the break, thereby providing an argument for interrupted use. However, RUBY 236, an F coin, was unevenly struck; and the 1973 GENA, while uncirculated and generally sharp, was also unevenly struck. The malalignment of the dies, causing unevenness in striking, might easily conceal the weak break. It will be necessary, then, to re-examine the higher-grade, sharply struck G-2's to see whether or not they have the break.

Reverse rim breaks at the border near RICA are seen in the RUBY 237, and the catalogue concludes that it was evidently struck after the earlier 1805 stemless coins.

The small defect from the fourth outside leaf on the left to the center of E in UNITED (which DAVID PROSKEY calls a scratch and GILBERT a break) does not attract any attention from the cataloguers. Nor is there any mention of the small defect from the third inside leaf on the left towards the top of the H in HALF

1804 G-3, CAM-12

Uncirculated grades: (1) P. MOUGEY 298 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (2) G.H. EARLE 3622 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (3) DR. G.P. FRENCH 364 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (4) A.W. JACKMAN 870 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (5) F.R. ALVORD 99 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (6) B. BLUESTONE 362 (2/1946); (7) C.M. WILLIAMS 704 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) MS 60; (8) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1081 (STACK'S 1954) as VIRGIL BRAND; (9) 1954 ANA Conv. Sale 94 (FED. COIN EXCH.) ~~FED. COIN EXCH. 94 (ANA EXCH.) Sale, 1954)~~; (10) L. MERKIN 104 (3/1967); (11) W. VAN RODEN 116 (STACK'S, 1968); (12) R.T. DAVIS 4 (STACK'S, 1968); (13) L. MERKIN 49 (9/1968); (14) R.L. MILES JR. 17 (STACK'S, 1969); (15) COINS & CURRENCY, INC. 1424 (5/1970); (16) G.F. SCANLON 7 (STACK'S, 1973); (17) 1973 GRAND CENTRAL Conv. Sale 1093 (PARAMOUNT) ~~1973~~ MS 65.

AU grades: (18) T.L. ELDER 2317 (5-19-1923), H. RYDER 288 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) AU 50, R.E. COX, JR. 178 (STACK'S, METRO. NY. CONV., 1962) as uncirculated, J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) as uncirculated, gem, L. MERKIN 110 (3/1968) AU 50-55, W.R.T. SMITH (FPL Nov.-Dec. 1973) AU 55; (19) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 489 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (20) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 349 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945) as uncirculated, ~~ANA Conv.~~ 1971 ANA Conv. Sale (STACK'S) as AU; (21) F.W. GEISS 289 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), L.G. LAHRMAN 70 (A. KOSSOFF, 1963); (22) WINTER COLL. 1049 (STACK'S, Jan.-Feb. 1974)

EF grades: (23) W.W. NEIL 2220 (B.M. MEHL, 1947).

VF grades: (24) DR. C.L. RUBY 235 (SUPERIOR, 1974, PART I)

04 G-3

Uncirculated examples having been coming to light in the last twenty years. The HILLYER RYDER catalogue (1924) said that only three were known. By September, 1968, the Justin Herman catalogue reports that seven or eight were known, most of them dark. It would seem that even more are now known.

Sometimes the obverse shows a rusted die, as the RYDER and MERKIN (9/1968) specimens. The last mentioned coin was also struck from clashed dies. Planchet defects exist in the form of clipped edges (F.W. GEISS and L.G. LAHRMAN) and laminations (Dr. C.L. RUBY).

Some examples of this variety are found with perfect reverses (L. MERKIN 49, Sept. 1968). In others, reverse run breaks are seen (Dr. C.L. RUBY, and the MERKIN 104 sold in hand, 1967). The MERKIN 104 break is said to be at MER, between IC, and near the right ribbon. The RUBY catalogue does not specify where the run breaks appear, but describes them, taken together, as the lot do state, and adds that the coin was "evidently struck after some 1805 Stemless coins and the early Plain 4 Stemless coins, which do not show these breaks."

1804 G-3

However, some examples of the Plan 4, Stemless reverse (1804 G-2, CHM-13) definitely show the rim break to some extent (RUBY 237), while others do not not (RUBY 236). Similarly, there are some examples of the 1805, Stemless reverse (G-1, CHM-1), such as the RUBY 239, that show the start of the ~~ribbon~~ rim break below the right ribbon. Most of those 1805's however, do not show the break, although the catalogues are not sufficiently detailed in the descriptions ~~regarding~~ of this reverse.

Where does this leave us? If the reverse break started in the 1805 G-1 die marriage, as it apparently did, what ~~can~~ explains the catalogues' findings of perfect reverses in certain examples of 1804 G-2 and G-3, which were apparently struck later? If ~~the~~ the catalogue descriptions are accurate, there must have been some interruption in the marriage.

The obscurity in the development of this reverse die break is reflected in the different succession sequences assigned to these three ~~coins~~ coins.

The ~~small~~ small reverse flow or break between the E of UNITED and the leaf, being inconspicuous, is ignored by the catalogueers.

The only obverse breaks that are mentioned are in the Federal Coin Exchange catalogue for its ANA 1954 sale where, under lot 94, two breaks are mentioned; one, at point of bust; and the other, at left of date. These have yet to be confirmed on other specimens.

1804 G-4, COMM-10

Uncirculated grades: (1) DR G.P. FRENCH (U.S. COIN CO, 12-[illegible]-1912); (2) U.S. COIN CO. 487 (2-6-1918); (3) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 447 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (4) F.R. ALVORD 100 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (5) F.R. ALVORD 101 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) a second sample; (6) COMM. W.C. EATON 1017 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (7) B. BLUESTONE 361 (2/1946); (8) C.M. WILLIAMS 706 (NUMIS. GAL, 1950) MS 66; (9) M.A. HOLMES 1298 (STACK'S, 1960); (10) G. PIERCE 11 (STACK'S, 1963); (11) S.W. WOLFSON 9 (STACK'S, 1963); (12) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (13) L. MERKIN 50 (9/1968); (14) W. VAN RODEN 117 (STACK'S, 1968); (15) ALTO COLL. 519 (STACK'S, 1970); (16) A.R. TURIN, 208 (STACK'S, 1972); (17) TERRELL COLL. 94 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1973).

AU grades: (18) B. BLUESTONE 6 (2/1945); (19) R.L. MILES, JR. 18 (STACK'S, 1969).

VF grades: (20) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 111 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968).

I have had to omit the uncirculated WM. SLEICHER 1190 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919), thus said to be of P. MOUGEY 299 and attributed as G-4. The MOUGEY catalogue describes lot 299 as a "spaded clip" coin, so it cannot be G-4. I have also omitted the uncirculated 1973 ANA Conv. lot 1695 (JESS PETERS), because it is either G-4 or G-5.

The catalogues do not mention any breaks.

The ALVORD 100 is said to be orange, in color. The obverse of the ALTO specimen is said to exhibit "considerable mint red" and the reverse to be "mostly full color." A number of others have traces of red.

1804 G-5, CMM-9

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.C. MILLER 1038 (T.L. ELDER, 1917).

AU grades: (2) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 492 (T.L. ELDER, 12-8-27), H. RYDER 287 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) AU55; (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), R.L. TOLLETT 3 (STACK'S, 1971); (4) L. MERKIN 51 (SEPT., 1968) AU 55.

EF grades: (5) F.R. ALVORD 102 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (6) C.M. WILLIAMS 708 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) EF 40; (7) L.G. LAHRMAN 72 (NUMIS. GAL., 1963) "about" EF; (8) W. VAN RODEN 118 (STACK'S, 1964).

VF grades: (9) R.B. LEEDS 1006 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906), NN 59th SALE 1128 (1967) VF 35; (10) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 491, second sample (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (11) W.W. NEIL 2222 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) "about" VF; (12) A. SHUFORD 144 (A. KOSOFF, 1968) VF 25.

F grades: (13) J. BROBSTON, second sample (STACK'S, 1963); (14) A.R. TURINI 209 (STACK'S, 1972); (15) DR. C.L. RUBY 232 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974) F-VF; (16) DR. C.L. RUBY 233, an earlier strike (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

The obverse die is found unbroken (RUBY 232); or with four die cracks through LIBERTY and date (MERKIN 51, ~~Sept~~ 9/1968); or with a heavy run break over ~~top~~ the top of RTY, together with the four breaks at LIBERTY and date. The reverse crack (or expanding flaw) from R to the rim is not mentioned, probably because it is always seen.

~~The New Netherlands 59th Sale (1~~

The LESTER MERKIN catalogue for the September, 1968 sale says that only two MS 60 examples of this variety are known; and that the AU55 specimen then offered was tied with the HILLYER RYDER specimen for third place. A VF35 coin, offered in the New Netherlands 59th sale (1967) catalogue, was noted to be the fifth finest known. The RYDER sale called this variety rare in condition 50 or higher.

1800 G-6, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) F.R. ALLORD 106 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (2) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 112 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968).

VF grades: (3) C.M. WILLIAMS 710 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (4) MAYFLOWER COIN AUCT. 23 (3/1957); (5) L.G. LAHRMAN 93 (NUMIS. GAL., 1963); (6) COINS & CURRENCY, INC. 1427 (5/1970).

F grades: (7) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 493 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (8) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 352 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (9) W.W. NEIL 2223 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) "about" F; (10) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1073 (STACK'S, 1954)

VG grades: (11) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 493 (T.L. ELDER, 1927), a second sample; (12) HARMER, ROOKE 6271 (5/1970).

The BROBSTON catalogue called this coin the finest known. The MERKIN catalogue (March, 1968) agreed and added that the second base (unidentified) is only EF.

The reverse die, in this variety, is found both perfect and broken. The break may be faint, as in the BROBSTON specimen; or, so advanced (as in the second BROBSTON specimen, nearly F) that the ES, the O, and the upper leaves are hardly visible. A number of other reverse breaks are known today, not mentioned in the catalogues.

1804 G-7, CAA-8

Uncirculated grades: (1) DR. G.P. FRENCH 366 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (2) U.S. COIN CO. 490 (2-6-1918); (3) F.R. ALVORD 108 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) T.L. ELDER 2719 (JUNE, 1932); (5) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 353 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (6) C.M. WILLIAMS 711 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) MS 60; (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), probably appearing again as ~~L. MERKIN~~ HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 113 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968) MS 65, where it was identified as ex RYDER and BROBSTON (although the was not G-7 in the HILLYER RYDER Sale of 1924); (8) M.A. HOLMES 1300 (STACK'S, 1960); (9) A.R. TURINI 212 (STACK'S, 1972); (10) "TERRELL" COLL. 93 (AMER. AUCT ASSN., 1973).

AU grades: (11) L.P. JONES 372 (T.L. ELDER, 1922); (12) T.J. CLARKE 453 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (13) J. BROBSTON, another example (STACK'S, 1963); (14) L. MERKIN 82 (June, 1968); (15) COINS & CURRENCY, INC. 1426 (MAY, 1970).

EF grades: (16) B. BLUESTONE 14 (11-2-50), DR. C.L. RUBY 231 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974); (17) NN 56th Sale 424 (1962) "choice" EF 40; (18) L.G. LAHRMAN 75 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) EF 40; (19) L. MERKIN 52 (Sept., 1968); (20) FLA. UNITED NUM. CONV. 1973 SALE 1060 (RARCOA).

VF grades: (21) F.R. ALVORD 109 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (22) NN 56th Sale 427 (1962) VF 30; (23) L.G. LAHRMAN 76 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) VF 30, identified as ex PROSKEY and HUGHES (although D.O. HUGHES 70, sold by STACK'S in 1948, graded their example of this variety as F); (24) NN 59th Sale 1127 (1967) VF 25.

VG grades: (25) J. BROBSTON, another example (STACK'S, 1963); (26) A.R. TURINI 213 (STACK'S, 1972).

The BROBSTON mint state example, graded 65 in the MERKIN sale of March, 1988, was described as "practically flawless" and said to be "probably fresh brown"

The single crack through LIBERTY is common. It may be very light (ALVORD and the BROBSTON unc.) or heavy (RUBY). But the rim chip-off over LIBE is rare and usually found on lower grades. ~~(BROBSTON VG, and TURINI, both VG; ALVORD VF; RUBY cont. MERKIN (Apr., 1963) both EF)~~ The best examples that I found offered for sale are three EF's (MERKIN 9/68 called the finest known with rim break; RUBY; and the RARCOA (Fla. United Conv., 1973).

The NN 56th sale 427 (1962) exhibited incusation marks below the chin. This may be the same thing that George R. Ross tried to describe (his diverse 2c) when he spoke of "wavy lines under chin" (The Numismatist, March, 1916, page 112).

This diverse is the same as the first used in G-6, CMM-1, except that now it has (1) a spoked chin, formally called an "imperial" or "goatee", (2) a tongue-like protrusion, (3) a bulge to the right of the portrait, and (4) curved die striations in the field opposite the neck, resembling finger prints. Ross' explanation was: "Small scales from die produces a spike at chin and tongue at lips. Marks in right field probably caused by scales coherency to die." ~~[illegible]~~ Roger S. Cohen's suggestion is that the defects occurred during a redoubling process. Simple, poor workmanship of the mint may also provide part of the answer.

1804 G-8, COMM-6

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.P. SMITH DUP. SALE 588 (1906), NN 59th Sale 1126 (1967) MS 60; (2) T.L. ELDER 214 (2-25-1909); (3) G.H. EARLE 3621 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912), H. RYDER 286 (NN 44th, 1954) MS 65; (4) H.C. MILLER 1039 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (5) B.M. MEHL'S 94th Sale 273 (1939); (6) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1969) rev. die state 1; (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1969) rev. die state 8; (8) R.L. MILES, JR. 19 (STACK'S, 1969); (9) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 784 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (10) PARAMOUNT RCL. No. 7 (March, 1974)

AU grades: (11) U.S. COIN CO. 107 (6-20-1917); (12) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 859 (Feb., 1960); (13) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) rev. die state 6; (14) L. MERKIN ~~J. BROBSTON~~ 53 (Sept. 1968), die state 9 (sic); (15) NN 61st Sale 116 (1970) AU 50.

EF grades: (16) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 114 (L. MERKIN, 1968) rev. state 1; (17) 1973 FLA. UNITED NUM. CONV. SALE 1061 (RARCOA). ~~(17)~~.

VF grades: (18) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) rev. die state 5; (19) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) rev. die state 7.

F grades: (20) F.R. ALVORD 110 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (21) DR. C.L. RUBY 230 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974) rev. die state 9 (sic).

~~The EARLE-RYDER MS 65 appears to be the finest known. An unbroken reverse die specimen is quite rare. Examples of Talbot reverse die state 1. The badly broken reverse is much more common.~~

04 G-8

The EARLE-RYDER MS65 is the finest known. Examples of this variety with unbroken reverses are quite rare. The reverse Bilbert die state 1 is uncommon. Badly broken reverses are the rule. These massive breaks ~~are the rule above~~ (combined with the smaller obverse breaks) are believed ~~as~~ to cause a slightly washed obverse impression (FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. SALE 1973, RARCOA).

~~Above the base natural color one can find in this variety is light tan or olive, with traces of mint fade wash or around the devices or lettering.~~

1804 C-9, CMM-7

EF grades: (1) F.R. KIMBALL 981 (T.L. ELDER, 1921).

VF grades: (2) G. PIERCE 12 (STACK'S, 1965); (3) L.G. LAHRMAN 79 (NUMIS. GAL., 1963) VF 20-25.

F grades: (4) F.R. ALVORD 112 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) reeded, and used in the BROBSTON catalogue to be scratched; (5) C.M. WILLIAMS 713 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) F 15; (6) COMM. W.C. EATON 530 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929), ANDERSON-DUPONT 1076 (STACK'S, 1954) F 15, obverse scratched; (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) "bordering on VF"; (8) W. VAN RODEN 122 (STACK'S, 1968); (9) L. MERKIN 54 (9/1968) ex W. BREEN, "almost" F.

VG grades: (10) COMM. W.C. EATON 1023 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929, BARDEEN collection); (11) NN Sixth Sale 1176 (1958); (12) A.R. TURINI 217 (STACK'S, 1972); (13) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale 1697 (JESS PETERS) pitting.

G grades: (14) F.R. ALVORD 113 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924), second sample.

This variety is sold more often by private treaty than by public auction.

The F.R. KIMBALL EF specimen was reported by T.L. ELDER as the "probably best known example of this very rare reverse." ROGER S. COHEN, JR mentions an AU sample (P-W 39, page 229).

The reverse of this variety may be found without a rim break (L.G. LAHRMAN), or with a crack over OF A (W.C. EATON-ANDERSON-DUPONT), or with the rim broken out over TES, and O to I (F.R. ALVORD 113)

~~H. CHAPMAN in 1925 which had the brockage OF A, has~~
~~was graded as VG. On the other hand the EATON 530~~
~~sold on the same date lot was graded F, but the~~
~~brockage was said to be over "OF A."~~

The difficulties in tracing coins is underscored by the Eaton lots. Although Comm. Eaton wrote in 1921 that he had "over four hundred and twenty half cents" in his collection (The Numismatist, Nov., 1921, page 518), the sale of his coins in 1929 includes only 308 specimens in 109 lots. Thus, at least 112 were placed privately, even assuming no other coins were acquired by him. A designation such as "ex Eaton", without being more specific, may not refer to the Eaton lots of 1929.

1804 G-10, CMM-10

EF grades: (1) 1954 ANA sale 98 (FED. COIN EXCH.); (2) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), said to be the finest known.

VF grades: (3) R. HEWITT and B.C. BARTLETT 1171 (T.L. ELDER, 1918).

F grades: (4) J. PAWLING 94 (NN 39th sale, 1952), black incrustations on both sides; (5) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1074 (STACK'S, 1954) F12, rough, nicked and scratched, and said to be of COMM. W.C. EATON, but I cannot trace it to Henry Chapman's 1929 Eaton sale; (6) L.G. LAHRMAN 80 (A. KOSOFF, 1963), obverse scratches, reverse rough, "about F.

VG grades: (7) F.R. ALVORD 114 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) VG-8; (9) R.S. COHEN, JR., another rough and has plate coin, FPL No. 1 (1972) VG-8.

Fair grades: (10) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 497 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (11) DR D.W. VALENTINE 498 (T.L. ELDER, 1927)

The catalogues do not discuss the die breaks, either obverse or reverse, that are known to exist.

1804 G-11, CMM-5

AU grades: (1) J.D. SWEYD 78 (A. KOSOFF, 1963).

EF grades (2) W.W. NEIL 2226 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (3) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 116 (L. MERKIN 3/1968); (4) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972); (5) COMM. W.C. EATON 1024 (H. CHAPMAN 1929), being part of the BARDEEN collection.

VF grades: (6) G.O. WALTON 56 (STACK'S, 1963); (7) L. MERKIN 55 (9/1968) "just about" VF; (8) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972), another example; (9) WINTER COLL. 1050 (STACK'S, 1974).

F grades: (10) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1075 (STACK'S, 1954) F15; (11) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) "nearly" VF; (12) A.R. TURINI 218 (STACK'S, 1972) "nearly" VF, "an good duplicate of the Brobston coin."

VG grades: (13) DR. G.P. FRENCH 420 (U.S. COIN CO., 1915; not to be confused with the same firm's DR. G.P. FRENCH Half Cent Sale of December 5, 1917); (14) C.M. WILLIAMS 714 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (15) J. PAWLING 95 (NN 39th Sale, 1952); (16) H. RYDER 285 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) VG-10, "looks as if it might have been in a fire."

G grades: (17) F.R. ALVORD 115 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (18) COMM. W.C. EATON 531 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929).

This variety is very much less rare than once thought, although it is still hard to come by in EF45, or higher. The numerous breaks are not much discussed by the cataloguers. However, the example sold in Lester Merkin's September, 1968 sale was said to have extensive reverse die breaks, without a rim break. The ANDERSON-DUPONT reverse was described as "weak at top as always." This might be due to a reverse break.

1804 CMM-2, Hd on Gilbert $\left(\frac{G-10}{G-6}\right)$

None offered.

1804 CMM-3, Hd on Gilbert $\left(\frac{G-6}{G-10}\right)$

None offered.

1805 G-1, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1949 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890); (2) R.B. WINSOR 1023 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (3) H.P. SMITH 1201 (CHAPMAN BROS., MAY, 1906); (4) P. GSCHWEND 702 (T.L. ELDER, 1908); (5) G.H. EARLE 3626 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (6) U.S. COIN CO., 111 (6-20-1917); (7) A.W. JACKMAN 872 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (8) T.L. ELDER 2319 (5/1923); (9) F.R. ALVORD 116 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (10) F.R. ALVORD 117 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (11) COMM. W.C. EATON 1025 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929), part of the BARDEEN collection; (12) T.L. ELDER 2721 (6/1932); (13) H. RYDER 292 (NN 44th Sale, 1954), at "a CHAPMAN sale, May 1, 1902," MS 60; (14) S.W. WOLFSON. II (STACK'S, 1963); (15) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (16) I.E. BAKER 654 (STACK'S, 1964); (17) G. PIERCE 13 (STACK'S, 1965); (18) W. VAN RODEN 123 (STACK'S, 1968); (19) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 117 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968); (20) L. MERKIN 608 (3/1969) MS 65, at VIRGIL BRAND, "equal to Brobston"; (21) R.L. MILES, JR. 20 (STACK'S, 1969); (22) BOWERS and RUDDY, Rare Coin Review No. 19 (1974), erroneously identified as "Small 5, Stems to Wreath," but actually a Small 5, Stemless.

AU grades: (23) MAJ. W.B. WETMORE 698 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1130 (1967) AU55; (24) T.L. ELDER 2319 (5/1923); (25) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 499 (T.W. ELDER, 1927); (26) G.E. CHATILLON 1652 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (27) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 356 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (28) NN 54th Sale 1626 (1960); (29) NN 56th Sale 428 (1962) AU50-55; (30) L.G. LAHRMAN 82 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (31) L. MERKIN 56 (9/1968) cleaned; (32) ALTO COLL. 520 (STACK'S, 1970); (33) TERRELL COLL. 98 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1973).

EF grades: (34) W.W. NEIL 2229 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), L.G. LAHRMAN 81 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (35) C.M. WILLIAMS 715 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) EF40; (36) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1089 (STACK'S, 1954) EF45; (37) F. BALDENHOFER 92 (STACK'S, 1955);

(38) G.V. NELSON 5 (STACK'S, 2/1971); (39) 1973 FLA. UNITED NUM. CONV. Sale 1062 (RARCOA).

VF grades: (40) L. HERRIN 107 (3/1967); (41) DR. C.L. RUBY 239 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974) & DAVID O. HUGHES, 5-23-46.

The rarity of ~~mint~~ mint state specimens of this variety is exaggerated. As late as 1962, it was felt that there were few known and that an AU 50-55 was in the condition census. Even allowing for seller's exaggeration and unidentified "repeaters," it would seem that the twenty-two mint state examples listed above require a re-appraisal of its rarity. The Brobston and Brand MS 65's head the condition census. The Herbert March, 1969, catalogue says that "~~of~~ no fully red specimens are known."

A good many specimens of this variety are sharply struck, but there are exceptions. The ANDERSON-DUPONT is not well struck up at the head; the HARLAN P. SMITH coin has weak obverse milling behind the bust and at the corresponding reverse area; the COMM. W.C. EATON example is also "not well struck up" at the edge; and the coin sold by RARCOA at the 1973 Florida convention was described as "somewhat soft" in the center.

The catalogue descriptions do not support Gilbert's findings that this variety "is frequently found with the circle of the figure 5 in date closed by a faint crack or graver's mark, and upon the Rev. a break from U ~~of~~ to border, and the entire wreath double cut." Nor do they question those observations.

The Gilbert plate coin shows the Halloran Ryder obverse.

1805 G-2, CMM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) W.W. NEIL (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (2) B.M. MEHL 23 (114th Sale, 1951); (3) R.T. McPHERSON 26 (STACK'S, 1953); (4) MAYFLOWER COIN AUCT. 33 (3/1957); (5) P.G. STRAUS 66 (STACK'S, 1959); (6) M.A. HOLMES 1302 (STACK'S, 1960); (7) 1971 ANA Sale 1 (STACK'S).

AU grades: (8) MAJ. R. LAMBERT 695 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1910), graded uncirculated, H. RYDER 291 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) graded "nearly" MS 60; (9) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 500 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (10) P. MOUGEY 300 (T.L. ELDER, 1910) there graded uncirculated, W.B. HALE 274 (B.M. MEHL, 1939), now graded AU; (11) DR. C.A. ALLENBURGER 574 (B.M. MEHL, ROYAL SALE, 1943); (12) STACK'S 6 (12-14-1962 Sale); (13) J.D. SWEYD 79 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) AU 55; (14) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (15) L. MERKIN 109 (3/1967); (16) R.L. MILES, JR. 21 (STACK'S, 1969); (17) G.V. NELSON 6 (STACK'S, 2-5-71).

EF grades: (18) T.L. ELDER 173 (12-6-1906), NN 59th Sale 1131 (1967) EF 40; (19) NN 56th Sale 429 (1962); (20) WINTER COLL. 1051 (STACK'S, 1974).

VF grades: (21) F.R. ALVORD 119 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (22) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1088 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 20; (23) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 786 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) VF 30; (24) A-MARK December, 1972 catalogue.

Some of the coins of this variety offered as uncirculated ~~[illegible]~~ might be truly less than mint state. The AU Merkin (3/1967) coin is said to be in the condition census.

Rusted fields are sometimes evident (LAMBERT-RYDER). David Proskey said that "the surface in several places is granulated, the effect of

acid in cleaning the die" (Coin Collector's Journal, Jan. 1881, page 4).

Die breaks, when mentioned at all, are generalized as "early state" (ANDERSON-DUPONT, and ELDER-NN 594 tab) or "late state" (MERKIN March, 1967 tab). In the HILLYER RYDER tab, it was noted that the reverse rim was not broken on (O)F A(MERICA). ~~[illegible]~~ The reverse of this coin also exhibits auction marks.

1805 G-3, CMM-3

VF grades: (1) QUALITY SALES CORP. 16 (March, 1972); (2) R.T. HERDEGEN 170 (SCHULMAN, 1973).

F grades: (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963) "just about" F; (4) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 118 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968); (5) L. MERKIN 57 (Sept., 1968) F+.

VG grades: (6) F.R. ALVORD 121 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) W.B. HALE 276 (B.M. MEHL, 1939), perhaps the same coin as G.E. CHATILLON 1654 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (8) C.M. WILLIAMS 717 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950); (9) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1087 (STACK'S, 1954) VG-8; (10) MAYFLOWER COIN AUCT. 32 (March, 1957); (11) NN 51st Sale 1186 (1958) VG-10; (12) NN 51st Sale 1187 (1958) VG-7; (13) NN 54th Sale 1627 (1960); (14) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) VG-10; (15) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) VG-7.

G grades: (16) W. VAN RODEN 125 (STACK'S, 1968); (17) A.R. TURINI 221 (STACK'S, 1972); (18) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) G-4.

AG grades: (19) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 501 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (20) R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1 (1972) Fair 3.

A swelling before the face is noted in the ANDERSON-DUPONT, NN 51st Sale [redacted] and NN 54th Sale catalogues. A reverse weakness is common. In the NN 51st Sale catalogue, it was noted that "all 13 or 14 known specimens are weak" at left center of reverse. At VF level, it is not too noticeable. The obverse does has its problems. The LESTER MERKIN Sept., 1968 catalogue states that the specimen there offered was not struck up at the ribbon and part of the curls because of the badly worn and damaged obverse die.

The same MERKIN catalogue (Sept., 1968) noted that the F+

05- G-3
G-4

sample was "tied for fourth finest known, exceeded by three V.F.'s one of them impounded, a second unlocated for at least thirty years (the Bulbert Plate coin)."

1805 G-4, CAM-2

EF grades: (1) DR. C.L. RUBY 240 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974) "almost" EF, ex G.J. BAUER

F grades: (2) C.M. WILLIAMS 718 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) F 15; (3) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1036 (STACK'S, 1954) ex Comm. W.C. EATON, "burnished, tooled and retoned"; (4) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (5) R.L. MILES, JR. 22 (STACK'S, 1969).

VG grades: (6) J.C. MORGENTHAU 512 (4-26-1932); (7) ~~FED. BRAND to~~ "MILLION DOLLAR AUCTION" 10 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (8) A.R. TURINI 222 (STACK'S, 1972).

No die breaks are reported by these catalogues. The RUBY catalogue says that the RUBY specimen is the finest known by nearly 20 points. It adds: "Besides the present coin, there are possibly two others that might even be called 'Very Fine, but...', and possibly three or four others that would rate Fine."

1806 G-1, CMA-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) G.M. PARSONS 1961 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (2) DR. G.P. FRENCH 369 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (3) U.S. COIN CO. 494 (2-6-1918); (4) A.W. JACKMAN 873 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (5) T.L. ELDER 1806 (5-19-1923); (6) F.R. ALVORD 124 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) F.R. ALVORD 125 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) B.M. MEHL 165 (87th Sale, 1933); (9) S.W. FREEMAN 1053 (KREISBERG & SCHULMAN, 1958); (10) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (11) NN 59th Sale 5 (1963); (12) L.G. LAHRMAN 85 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (13) W. VAN RODEN 126 (STACK'S, 1968); (14) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 119 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968) "just about" MS60; (15) R.L. MILES, JR. 23 (STACK'S, 1969), (16) "MILLION DOLLAR SALE" 787 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) MS 60; (17) NN 61st Sale 5 (1970); (18) COINS AND CURRENCY, INC. 1431 (5/1970); (19) PARAMOUNT RCL No. 7 (3/1974).

AU grades: (20) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 502 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (21) S.H. McVITTY 21 (B.M. MEHL, 3-22-38); (22) EMPIRE COLL. 85 (STACK'S, 1957); (23) NN 56th Sale 431 (1962) AU55; (24) L. MERKIN 58 (9/1968); (25) R. MARKS 2 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1972); (26) TERRELL COLL. 101 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (27) DURHAM COLL. 77 (SUPERIOR, 1973) "prooflike toning"; (28) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale 1702 (JESS PETERS); (29) 1973 FLA. UNITED Conv. Sale 1064 (RARCOA).

EF grades: (30) C.M. WILLIAMS 719 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF 25; (31) H. RYDER 294 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) & WAYTE RAYMOND, VF 30; (32) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1091 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 30; (33) L. MERKIN 111 (3/1967); (34) DR. C.L. RUBY 243 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974); (35) DR. C.L. RUBY 244 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974) & S.M. KOEPEL, "almost" EF; (36) DR. C.L. RUBY 245 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974), & B.A. BARSTOW 1-31-1946, "almost" EF.

The catalogue for NN 61st sale (1970) says that only seven mint state examples of this variety are known, none in MS 70.

RUBY 245 shows a "rare crack through tops of LIBERTY", and possibly also MERKIN 58 (9/1968) although then the "rare" crack is not identified. The common reverse breaks are found in E.R. ALVORD 124 (along the edge over RICA O), S.W. FREEMAN (over the space between the last A in AMERICA and the right ribbon end), and RUBY 244. The intermediate reverse die state is said to show only the lowest rim break (L. MERKIN 3/1967).

Obverse clash marks were seen in RUBY 244 and L. MERKIN 58 (9/1968). The absence of serious clash marks was taken to signify an early die state (RUBY 243). Sometimes a re-cut 6 is evident (S.W. FREEMAN).

There are sharp strikes (ALVORD 124 and HELFENSTEIN-JUDD), flat strikes (S.W FREEMAN), and uneven strikes (RUBY 243, RUBY 244).

The HILLYER RYDER obverse is the GILBERT plate coin.

1806 G-2, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B. WINSOR 1025 (CHAPMAN BROS, 1895), J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 120 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968); (2) J.C. ~~HORGENT~~ MORGENTHAU + CO. 513 (278th Sale, 1932); (3) B.M. MEHL 26 (114th Sale, 1951); (4) MILLION DOLLAR AUCT. 12 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (5) R.L. MILES, JR. 24 (STACK'S, 1969)

AU grades: (6) H. RYDER 293 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) AU50; (7) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1090 (STACK'S, 1954).

VF grades: (8) 1953 ANA Conv. Sale 3457 (A. KOSOFF), L.G. LAHRMAN 89 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (9) L. MERKIN 59 (9/1968) "almost" EF, cleaned; (10) TERRELL COLL. 102 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973) VF plus.

F grades: (11) F.R. ALVORD 126 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (12) NN 48th Sale 818 (1956) F over VF; (13) STACK'S 491 (Sale of 12-15-62, SALMON consignment) "close to" VF; (14) L. MERKIN 110 (3/1967) "about" VF; (15) A-MARK Dec, 1972 catalogue; (16) WM. R.T. SMITH FPL May, 1973 F12; (17) WINTER COLL. 1052 (STACK'S, Jan.-Feb. 1974 Sale) or KAGIN'S Sale, 9/1972.

VG grades: (18) W.W. NEIL 2233 (B.M. MEHL, 1947).

G grades (19), (20) and (21) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 504, 505, and 506 (T.L. ELDER, 1927).

~~AG~~ AG grades: (22) DR. C.L. RUBY 242 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

The WINSOR-BROBSTON-HELFENSTEIN-JUDD is ~~[illegible]~~ both the discovery piece and the finest known. It also illustrates the early die state, before the diverse die break developed and before the dies clashed.

The examples of this variety appear to have led hard lives: they come dented, scratched, pitted, bent,

burnished, cleaned, and blackened.

The B. MAX MEHL uncirculated example is unique, being described as showing "colored friction" on the highest parts of the surfaces.

The strikes may be sharp (WINSOR-BROBSTON-HELFENSTEIN-JUDD), weak (MERKIN 3/1967 Sale), or uneven (STACK'S 4.91, SALMON consignment). In the last mentioned sale, the catalogue noted that the coin was "weakly struck on the left "as usual." This weakness, when present, is clearly seen on the reverse.

The GILBERT plate coin reverse is the HILLYER RYDER specimen.

1806 G-3, CAM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1953 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890); (2) H.P. SMITH DUP. 590 (CHAPMAN BROS., 6/1906), NN 59th Auk 1134 (1967) MS 65; (3) BRYANT COLL. 86 (L.H. LOW, 12-12-1906), NN 59th Auk 1135 (1967) MS 60; (4) G.H. EARLE, JR. 3628 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (5) M.N. JACKSON 1405 (U.S. COIN CO., 5/1913) "bright red"; (6) T.L. ELDER 401 (9-18-1913); (7) G.M. PARSONS 1962 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (8) G.M. ANDRUS 119 (U.S. COIN CO., 1/1915); (9) U.S. COIN CO. 113 (6-20-1917); (10) A.W. JACKMAN 874 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (11) L.P. JONES 376 (T.L. ELDER, 1922); (12) T.L. ELDER 2321 (5-15-1923); (13) F.R. ALVORD 127 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (14) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 508 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (15) COMM. W.C. EATON 1031 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929), a part of his BARDEEN collection; S.H. CHAPMAN 2062 (T.L. ELDER, 1929); (17) T.L. ELDER 2723 (6/1932); (18) P.C. CLARK 555 (M.H. BOLENDER, 1932); (19) M.H. BOLENDER 252 (120th Auk, 11/1938); (20) W.B. HALE 278 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (21) DR. C.A. ALLENBURGER 592 (B.M. MEHL, ROYAL SALE, 1948); (22) C.M. WILLIAMS 720 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) MS 65; (23) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1092 (STACK'S, 1954); (24) F. BALDENHOFER 95 (STACK'S, 1955); (25) 1955 MANA Conv. Auk 33 (AMER. COIN AUCT.); (26) T.J. CLARKE 454 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (27) M.A. HOLMES 1304 (STACK'S, 1960); (28) NN 56th Auk 433 (1962) MS 60; (29) S.W. WOLFSON 13 (STACK'S, 1963); (30) J. BROBSTEN (STACK'S, 1963); (31) J.D. SWEYD 82 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 65; (32) L. MERKIN 31 (9/1967) MS 65; (33) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 121 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968); (34) W. VAN RODEN 127 (STACK'S, 1968); (35) L. MERKIN 83 (6/1968); (36) R.L. MILES, JR. 25 (STACK'S, 1969); (37) ALTO COLL. 521 (STACK'S, 1970);

(38) G.V. NELSON 7 (STACK'S, 2-5-1971); (39) TERRELL COLL. 103 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (40) BOWERS and RUDDY, RARE COIN REVIEW No. 19 (1974).

AU grades: (41) H. RYDER 295 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) AU55; (42) L. MERKIN 60 (9/1968); (43) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 788 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) AU50-55; (44) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale 1700 (JESS PETERS); (45) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale 1701 (JESS PETERS), another sample.

VF grades: (46) DR. C.L. RUBY 246 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974); (47) DR. C.L. RUBY 248 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974), another sample.

Although there are many mint state samples of this variety, the catalogues have not classified any as MS70. But there is no reluctance to assign MS65 to a number of them (JACQUES D. SWEYD, the MERKIN 31 (9/1967), and the HARLAN P. SMITH - NN 59th Sale (1967) specimens).

The reverse of most of these coins is noticeably weak at the top, around ES and the upper leaves. In the BROBSTON coin, the leaves opposite ICA were said to be "weakly struck, as usual." Many of the coins are spotted, and on some obverses, a re-cut 6 is apparent.

The ~~commentary~~ commentary is summarized in the HILLYER RYDER, the DR. CHARLES L. RUBY (Part I), and the NN 56th Sale catalogues: The Chapman Hoard of 1906 "yielded a ~~[illegible]~~ profusion" of MS60 and MS65 specimens "with original red, most of them flatly struck in part, and marked on the fields." The early die state shows the re-cut 6. The Chapman Hoard samples are all late state coins, weak at the top of the wreath, and spotted.

1806 CMM-3, not in Sulfard $\left(\frac{G-1}{G-2}\right)$

VG grades: (1) COINS AND CURR., INC. 1432 (MAY, 1970); (2) R.T. HERDEGEN 173 (SCHULMAN, 1973), graded VG plus, and not attributed

G grades: (3) W.W. NEIL 2235 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1969).

The reverse is the same as on 1804 G-3, CMM-12 and exhibits the lost die state. The BROBSTON catalogue describes the break as extending from point of the R to the A, with a break-out connecting 1 C-4 the border.

1807 G-1, CHM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1955 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890), J. G. MILLS 1422 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904), P. MOUGEY 302 (T. L. ELDER, 1910); (2) H. C. MILLER 1043 (T. L. ELDER, 1917); (3) U.S. COIN CO. 497 (2-6-1918); (4) T. L. ELDER 2322 (5/1923); (5) F. R. ALVORD 130 (S. H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (6) T. L. ELDER 2724 (6/1932); (7) D. PROSKEY 1704 (STACK'S, PART I, 1939); (8) "WORLD'S GREATEST COLL." 359 (NUMIS. GAL., 1945); (9) B. M. MEHL 28 (114th Sale, 1951); (10) R. E. COX, JR. 191 (STACK'S, 1962); (11) NN 56th Sale 434 ~~(1962)~~ (1962) MS 60, HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 122 (L. MERKIN, 3/1968); (12) 1962 METRO. N.Y. NUM. CONV. Sale 191 (STACK'S); (13) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (14) R. L. MILES, JR. 26 (STACK'S, 1969); (15) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 789 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) MS 60; (16) WINTER COLL. 1053 (STACK'S, 1974).

AU grades: (17) C. STEIGERWALT 829 (5-22-1907), NN 59th Sale 1136 (1967) AU50; (18) W. RAYMOND (4-6-1926) as uncirculated, H. RYDER 296 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) AU50; (19) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1093 (STACK'S, 1954); (20) T. J. CLARKE 455 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (21) L. MERKIN 84 (6/1968); (22) L. MERKIN 61 (9/1968) AU or UNC; (23) A. R. TURINI 228 (STACK'S, 1972); (24) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale 1703 (J. PETERS).

VF grades: (25) C. M. WILLIAMS 722 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF25.

F grades: (26) DR. C. L. RUBY 249 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

The most frequent catalogue observation is the characteristic weak impression of this variety. The HILLYER RYDER catalogue says that many uncirculated examples "look like worn

coins even though with most lustre." A "sharp" strike will have nearly a complete dentillated border, with head and leaves sharp (HELFENSTEIN-JUDD). A fully sharp obverse is "almost unknown" (L. MERKIN, Sept., 1968). A common reverse weakness is at UNITED STATES (US COIN CO., Feb. 6, 1918). Worn, rusted dies are the cause of the weakness.

The early die state, which is rare, ~~(RUBY)~~ shows no rim breaks and a majority of the obverse border dentils (RUBY, and NN 56th Sale). The later die state shows a rim break over L1 (L. MERKIN, Sept., 1968). There is no mention of a break over TY, as reported by Gilbert.

The re-cut stem of the 7 is mentioned in the TURINI catalogue. The NN 56th Sale catalogue (1967) reports a "small obverse die crack at upper right of 7." Sometimes ~~[illegible] Coin World, January 26, 1972, page 61, the [illegible] top of the [illegible]~~ it is said that the top of the 7 is "doubled" at its right end (Coin World, Jan. 26, 1972, page 61). In others, the top of the 7 looks re-cut, like the stem.

In the NN 56th Sale catalogue, Walter Breen is quoted as saying that he knows of only four uncirculated examples with most red, and none of them are sharp.

1808 G-1, CAM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) W. F. JOHNSON SALE (1930) of the R. C. DAVIS collection (1885), lot 2670 conducted by N.Y. COIN & STAMP CO. (H. P. SMITH and D. PROSKEY); (2) P. MOUGEY 303 (T. L. ELDER, 1910)

AU grades: (3) P. D. HOCH 42 (L. H. LOW, Nov. 1, 1905) graded EF, H. RYDER 297 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) cleaned, graded AU50, EMPIRE coll. 88 (STACK'S, 1957); (4) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1094 (STACK'S, 1954); (5) NN 56th Sale 437 (1962) AU55; (6) NN 56th Sale 438 (1962) graded EF40, L. MERKIN 62 (Sept., 1968) graded AU; (7) R. L. MILES, JR. 27 (STACK'S, 1965).

EF grades: (8) T. L. ELDER 1426 (June, 1911); (9) DR. G. P. FRENCH 372 (U.S COIN CO., 1917); (10) J. S. JENKS 6258 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (11) T. L. ELDER 2158 (April 11, 1925); (12) W. C. ATWATER 142 (B. M. MEHL, 1946), appearing again in B. M. MEHL'S ~~[illegible]~~ 114th Sale (1951) lot 29; (13) L. MERKIN 614 (March 1969) EF 40.

VF grades (14) F. R. ALVORD 131 (S. H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (15) T. L. ELDER 2725 (June, 1932); (16) F. BALDENHOFER 97 (STACK'S, 1955); (17) R. E. COX, JR. 193 (STACK'S, 1962); (18) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (19) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 790 (HARMER ROOKE, 1963)

F grades: (20) MAJ. W. B. WETMORE 701 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1137 (~~[illegible]~~ 1967) F12; (21) DR. D. W. VALENTINE 513 (T. L. ELDER, 1927); (22) W. W. NEIL 2237 (B. M. MEHL, 1947); (23) C. H. WILLIAMS 723 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) F 12; (24) J. BROBSTON, second sample (STACK'S, 1963); (25) HELPENSTEIN-JUDD 123 (L. MERKIN, 1968); (26) DR. C. L. RUBY 250 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

In the NN 56th catalogue, the uncirculated MOUGEY specimen, graded MS60, was stated to be in the ERIC NEWMAN collection, of NEWCOMB and Col. GREEN; and it was also described as the only uncirculated example known. It may be the same one, therefore, that was in the ROBERT COULTON DAVIS collection (1888) sold by HARLAN P. SMITH and DAVID PROSKEY in 1890.

The obverse may be found perfect (the BROBSTON VF, ANDERSON-DUPONT), or broken over TY (the BROBSTON F, RUBY 250, ALVORD 132, VALENTINE) or with a break through BERT in addition to the break out over TY (COX, RUBY 251)

No mention is made of reverse die states, such as the break or flaw projecting from the fourth outside leaf on the right.

Sharp strikes are not uncommon. ~~The RYDER obverse with the Gilbert plate coin~~ Colors, where mentioned, are ~~described as~~ brown, except that the VALENTINE coin is black. The RYDER obverse is the Gilbert plate coin.

1808 G-2, CMM-3

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1957 (CHAPMAN BROS, 1893), J. G. MILLS 1424 (H. CHAPMAN, 1904); (2) DR. G. P. FRENCH 373 (U.S. COIN CO., DEC. 5, 1917), A. CHAMPA 592 (AMER. AUCT. ASSOC., 1972); (3) T. L. ELDER 2323 (MAY, 1923); (4) F.R. ALVORD 133 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (5) H. RYDER 298 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) & D. PROSKEY, J.D. SWEYD 85 (A. KOSOFF, 1963); (6) T.J. CLARKE 456 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (7) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (8) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 124 (L. MERKIN, MARCH, 1968); (9) W. VAN RODEN 130 (STACK'S, 1968); (10) L. MERKIN 615 (MARCH, 1969) MS60; (11) STACK'S 1124 (Sale of JUNE, 1970) possibly appearing again as G.F. SCANLON 12 (STACK'S, 1973) MS60, since in both sales the reverse is described as "lightly corroded."

AU grades: (12) W.W. NEIL 2238 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (13) ~~MANA~~ 1955 MANA Conv. Sale 34 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT) AU50; (14) M.A. HOLMES 1307 (STACK'S, 1960); (15) L. MERKIN 64 (SEPT., 1968) "about" AU; (16) R.L. MILES JR., 28 (STACK'S, 1969); (17) G.V. NELSON 9 (STACK'S, FEB, 1971)

EF grades: (18) T.L. ELDER 2159 (April, 1925); (19) W.B HALE 281 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (20) NN 56th Sale 439 (1962) EF 45; (21) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 791 (HARMER ROOKE, 1969)

VF grades: (22) C.M. WILLIAMS 724 (NUMIS. GAL., 1950) VF30; (23) L. MERKIN 115 (March, 1967)

F grades: (24) R.B. LEEDS 1013 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1138 (1967) F15; (25) J. BROBSTON, second example (STACK'S, 1963); (26) DR. C.L. RUBY 254 (SUPERIOR, PART II, 1974).

The NN 56th Sale (1962) catalogue says that six uncirculated specimens are known. Later catalogues by Stack's (BROBSTON) and Kosoff (SWEYD) repeat this.

In the WILLIAM B. HALE sale, B. Max Mehl reported a cracked die across the obverse, but no one else has confirmed this. In the WILL W. NEIL sale Mehl also suggests the existence of a small die defect at the neck. This, too, is unconfirmed.

The reverse die, which is the same as 1808 G-1, CMM-2, exhibits new characteristics. The late die state, illustrated by RUBY 254, shows a crack from the rim to I of UNITED, with the first outside berry on the left, and the first inside berry on the right, weakened but still visible. RUBY 255 exhibits a still later state. The RUBY catalogue says that late reverse die state examples are rare. The early die state lacks this reverse crack, and the berries are plain, as in MERKIN (March, 1967)

The catalogues do not mention the break from the inside leaf of the left branch of the wreath to the berry above, described by Roger S. Cohen, Jr. Nor is there mention of the crack or flaw from the tip of the fourth outside leaf on the right.

The BROBSTON catalogues notes that sharply struck obverses are unusual for this variety. Many examples of this variety are impressed weakly (MERKIN, Sept., 1968) or unevenly (LEEDS). Poorly-centered specimens (HILLYER RYDER) and rough planchets (NN 56th sale) are encountered.

The HILLYER RYDER obverse is illustrated on the Silber plate.

1808 CMM-1, not in Silber (G-1 new)

One offering: R.S. COHEN, JR. FPL No. 1. VG-8.

115 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10006
Sept 9, 1974

Roger S. Cohen, Jr.,
4720 Montgomery Lane,
Bethesda, Md., 20014

Dear Roger:

I hope you had a good summer. My family and I were at Shenandoah National Park, along the trails, and campsites, and hotels. In my mind there is nothing nicer than nature-in-the-raw. After that, we spent some time at the other extreme, the Colonial sophistication of Williamsburg.

Enclosed are the most recent pages for my Catalogue Iris article, which takes it up to 1835. I am now revising the earlier parts, written more than a year ago, to eliminate errors, and to update it with new information. I am now at the point where I can make a start at analyzing early, middle and late die states. The final step will be to check as many coins as possible for each variety.

Sincerely,
Neil

1809 CMM-1, with Gilbert (G-3/NEW)

F grades: (1) L. MERKIN, Sept. 1968 Sale, Lot 67, F-VF (heavy crack at tops of MERI).

VG grades: (2) R.S. COHEN, JR., F.P.L. No. 1 (1972) VG-8; (3) "WINTER" Sale 1056 (STACK'S, 1974).

G grades: (4) W.K. RAYMOND, P-W, Vol. VIII, No. 3, May 15, 1974, p. 150

While the heavy crack across the top of ~~AMERICA~~ MERI may safely be assumed to represent the late state of this rarely used reverse die, the cataloguers do not report whether any specimen shows an unbroken reverse, which would presumably be the early state. Perhaps that heavy crack caused this die to be discarded shortly after it had been put into the press.

1809 G-1, CMM-4

Uncirculated grades: (1) T.L. ELDER 331 (6-5-1911), H. RYDER 300 (NN 44th, 1954), MS 60, obv. being the Gilbert plate coin; (2) W. SLEICHER 1201 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (3) F.R. ALVORD 137 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) COMM. W.C. EATON 1036, part of the BARDEEN coll. (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (5) S.H. McVITTY 26 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (6) B. BLUESTONE 1623 (4-29-1943); (7) STACK'S 14 (April, 1959); (8) P.G. STRAUS 99 (STACK'S, 1959); (9) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (10) J.D. SWEYD 86 (NUM. GAL., 1963) MS 60; (11) G.V. NELSON 10 (STACK'S, Feb. 1971).

AU grades: (12) ANA 1946 Conv. Sale 1385 (NUM. GAL.); (13) C.M. WILLIAMS 725 (NUM. GAL., 1950) AU50;

EF grades: (14) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 516 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (15) W.W. NEIL 2240 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (16) NN 56th Sale 440 (1962); (17) NN-MBS 9 (9-26-67); (18) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 125 (L. MERKIN, 1968); (19) "WINTER" SALE 1054 (STACK'S, 1974).

One catalogue reports in 1962 that AU 50 was a condition census coin (NN 56th Sale); and another, in 1968, that a "full EF" would reach that level (Merkin Sale of Sept., 1968).

Many of the catalogues refer to sharp impressions for this variety. Others mention uneven strikes (HELFENSTEIN-JUDD) or "die failure" (ANDERSON-DUPONT, STACK'S, 1954) resulting in obverse weakness at the top and reverse weakness at the bottom. This may reflect an improper alignment of the dies.

Dave Proskey writing in the Coin Collector's Journal for February, 1881, page 19, erroneously referred to a hub defect (across the throat, through the hair, and below the ear) as a die crack. Ebenezer Sibley, who relied heavily on Proskey's observations of the varieties known to Proskey, repeated this. A number of catalogues have also described the hub defect as a die break not only for this variety (ALVORD Sale; COMM. EATON Sale; NN 56th Sale), but for other varieties of 1809, as well.

These dies remained unbroken during their use. Perhaps, the early state of the dies is seen in the sharp, even strikes with "every star struck up to perfection" (Bluestone Sale of April 29, 1943); whereas, the late state is seen in the uneven strikes resulting from out-of-plane die alignment (Anderson-Dugan).

1809 G-2, CMM-6

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B. LEEDS 1021 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1141 (1967); (2) F.R. ALVORD 139 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (3) T. J. CLARKE 239 (P.M. LANGE, Jan. 14-15, 1929); (4) COMM. W.C. EATON (BARDEEN Coll.) 1038 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (5) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2144 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (6) T.L. ELDER 1193 (Oct, 1933); (7) B. BLUESTONE 1624 (April 29, 1943); (8) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1102 (STACK'S, 1954) MS 60; (9) KREISBERG + SCHULMAN 862 (Feb., 1960); (10) M.A. HOLMES 1309 (STACK'S, 1960); (11) S.W. WOLFSON 15 (STACK'S, 1963); (12) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (13) G. PIERCE 17 (STACK'S, 1965); (14) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 126 (L. MERKIN, MAR., 1968) MS 65; (15) L. MERKIN 66 (Sept, 1968); (16) R.L. Miles, Jr. 29 (STACK'S 1969); (17) W.F. DELP 5 (STACK'S, 1972); (18) A.R. TURINI 232 (STACK'S, 1972); (19) TERRELL Coll. 4 (AM. AUCT. ASSN. 1972); (20) W.R.T. SMITH, FPL May, 1973, MS 60; (21) QUALITY SALES CORP. 959 (Sept., 1973)

AU grades: (22) N. SINGLETON 816 (T.L. ELDER, 1922); (23) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 517 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (24) W.W. NEIL 2241 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (25) J. PAWLING 102 (NN 35th Sale, 1952) AU50; (26) J. BROBSTON, a second sample (STACK'S, 1963); (27) H.M.F SCHULMAN 1620 (Dec., 1966); (28) L. MERKIN 118 (March, 1967).

Lester Merkin's Helfenstein-Judd catalogue, March, 1968, says that three specimens tie for MS 65. The Merkin September, 1968 catalogue reports that this variety is "softly struck at the borders." In one specimen, the leaves were weakly struck under AT (Merkin, March, 1967).

The obverse early die state shows a perfect die (Ruby 257). Later, clash marks appear, and a rim break starts above the head at about 12:30 o'clock (NN 59th Sale 1141, Ruby 258). The later state shows that the rim break has advanced to 5 o'clock (Brobston AU).

The reverse early die state is perfect (Ruby 257). Then, a light crack develops over STATES, before the obverse rim break starts (Markin 118, March 1967 Sale). In the late state, the crack becomes heavier, extends over STATES, and it exists together with the obverse rim break.

1809 G-3, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) A.W. JACKMAN 877 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (2) F.R. ALVORD 144 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (3) T.L. ELDER 2160 (4-11-25), H. RYDER 301 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) MS 60, ~~the~~ said to be one of three known uncirculated specimens; (4) T.L. ELDER 1983 (April, 1928); (5) T.J. CLARKE ~~2~~ 240 (P.M. LANGE, June 14-15, 1929); (6) T.J. CLARKE 241 (P.M. LANGE, June 14-15, 1929); (7) GEN. W.D. McCAW ~~2~~ 2145 (T.L. ELDER, Nov, 1930); (8) 1946 ANA Conv. Sale 1386 (NUM. GAL.); (9) ALTO Coll. 522 (STACK'S, 1970).

AU grades: (10) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1100 (STACK'S, 1954) AU55.

EF grades: (11) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (12) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 833 (May, 1966); (13) A. KREISBERG 2504 (MBS 10-31-66); (14) QUALITY SALES CORP. 362 (MBS 9-25-67); (15) KREISBERG, SCHULMAN & COHEN 1783 (Tenth Anniv. Sale, April 6-7-8, 1967); (16) G.O. WALTON 64 (STACK'S, 1966)

The stars on the right are often flat (Ryder). The Brobston cataloguer says that the condition census for this variety probably includes an EF sample.

The early obverse die state is perfect. The intermediate state shows a faint crack connecting ~~the~~ four stars on the right, but not extending into the date. In the late state, the crack has invaded the ~~9~~ 9 of the date and ~~[illegible]~~ has even gone into the ⊙. In addition, a crack in the left field has connected the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th stars on the left.

The early reverse ~~dies~~ die state is also perfect. A faint crack develops over ES to the border near O of OF. In the late use of this die, the rim break is found, in one direction, over OFA (Warren 9/68, Sol 68), and in the other direction over ED. The Warren catalogue for September, 1968 notes that the extender reverse break is "present" in the later 6-4 stamping "but the borders are usually too weak to show it."

The reverse is quite often stronger than the obverse. (Warren, April 1968 Sol).

1809 G-4, CMM-3

Uncirculated grade: (1) D.S. WILSON 1006 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (2) U.S. COIN CO. 118 (June 20, 1917); (3) DR. G.P. FRENCH 375 (US COIN CO., Dec. 5, 1917); (4) H.C. MILLER 1048 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (5) PROF. M.S. READ 1822 (T.L. ELDER, Feb., 1921); (6) T.L. ELDER 2324 (May 1923); (7) F.R. ALVORD 145 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 518 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (9) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2146 (T.L. ELDER, Nov. 22, 1930); (10) T.L. ELDER 300 (May, 1933); (11) B. BLUESTONE 1626 (April 29, 1943); (12) W.W. NEIL 2243 (B.M. MEHL, 1947), 1952 ANA Conv. Sale 492 (E. GANS et al.); (13) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1101 (STACK'S, 1954); (14) 1955 M.A.N.A. Conv. Sale 36 (Assoc. Coin Auct.); (15) P.G. STRAUS 80 (STACK'S, 1959); (16) M.A. HOLMES 1310 (STACK'S, 1960); (17) NN 56th Sale 441 (1962) MS 60; (18) J. BROBSTON, most red any Tom (STACK'S, 1963); (19) J. BROBSTON, sharp, a second sample (STACK'S, 1963), probably appearing again as HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 128 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968) described as J. Brobston; (20) J.D. SWEYD 88 (Num. Sal., 1963); (21) NN 57th Sale 6 (1963) described as unc. "or a hair's breadth away"; (22) L. MERKIN 86 (June, 1968) cleaned; (23) W. VAN RODEN 134 (STACK'S, 1968); (24) L. MERKIN 69 (Apl., 1968); (25) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 793 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (26) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 794, second sample, cleaned; HARMER, ROOKE, 1969; (27) J.C. RAWLS 1128 (STACK'S, 1970); (28) R.L. MILES, JR. 31 (STACK'S, 1969), MAYFLOWER COIN AUCT. 41 (May, 1973); (29) TERRELL Coll. 107 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1973).

The Warner, Rooks catalogue for the Million Dollar Sale (1968) says that only three MS 65's are known. While there must be considerable uncirculated examples, it is not easy to find a sharp one. Generally, the borders of both sides are weak, and the milling is not seen at the tops. Often, the entire right side is also weak, so that the stars do not show their centers.

The early state of the obverse die is perfect. Impressions are bold and sharp. Later, a break appears through the first two stars on the left, and clash marks are seen before the face (Merkin, Sept., 1968). The deteriorating reverse die probably causes a weakness on the obverse, right.

The early state of the reverse die begins with the late state of the G-3 reverse, that is, the rim break from ED to OF A although this is usually obscured by the weak borders of the variety (Merkin, Sept., 1968 catalogue, under lot 68). The ~~to~~ break worsens with the continued use of the die, and finally, the rim crumples at ED S and OF A.

1809 G-5, CMM-5

Uncirculated grades: (1) S.S. CROSBY 1675 (J.W. HASELTINE, 1883); (2) W. CARR 493 (E. SEARS, Oct. 1, 1909); (3) A.C. ZABRISKIE 920 (H. CHAPMAN, 1909), H. RYDER 299 (NN 44th, 1954); (4) P. MOUGEY 304 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (5) DR. G.P. FRENCH 374 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 5, 1917); (6) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 455 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (7) DR. G.P. FRENCH 1056 (H. CHAPMAN, Dec. 19, 1927); (8) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2147 (T.L. ELDER, Nov. 22, 1930); (9) B.M. MEHL 171 (May 5, 1933); (10) G.E. CHATILLON 1660 (B.M. MEHL, Nov. 15, 1938); (11) D. PROSKEY 1706 (STACK'S, 1939); (12) B. BLUESTONE 1627 (April 29, 1943); (13) F.W. GEISS 300 (B.M. MEHL, 1947) graded AU, L.C. LAHRMAN 103 (NUM. GAL., 1963) regraded MS 60; (14) B.M. MEHL 32 (114th Sale, 1951); (15) 1955 MANA Conv. Sale 35 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (16) T.J. CLARKE 457 (NUM. GAL., 1956); (17) PELLETREAU Coll. 13 (STACK'S, 1959); (18) M.A. HOLMES 1311 (STACK'S, 1960); (19) NN 56th Sale 442 (1962) MS 60; (20) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (21) STACK'S 1271 (Oct. 30-31, 1964); (22) G. PIERCE 18 (STACK'S, 1965); (23) L. MERKIN 117 (March, 1969); (24) L. MERKIN 70 (Sept, 1968) "just about" unc.; (25) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 796 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) MS 60; (26) QUALITY SALES CORP. 82 (MBS Nov. 30, 1970); (27) HATHAWAY & BOWERS CATALOGUE No. 8 (Nov. 8, 1970, p. 13); (28) J.C. RAWLS 807 (STACK'S, 1970); (29) G.V. NELSON 11 (STACK'S, Feb 5, 1971); (30) TERRELL Coll. 104 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (31) G.F. SCANLON 13 (STACK'S, 1973); (32) PARAMOUNT RARE COIN LIST NO. 7 (March, 1974); (33) L. MERKIN 263 (Sept. 11, 1974).

and regraded "V55" on letter";

In the above 33 sales of coins said by the cataloguers to have been uncirculated, only three were numerically graded 60; and as late as 1969, it was noted that only about a dozen were known in full mint state (Million Dollar Sale by Harmer, Rooke). ~~Even~~ Specimens that unquestionably display original, although toned, mint color seldom turn up.

The cataloguers do not draw attention to the fact that many of the coins offered are less than sharp. This may have resulted from a repolishing of the dies (J. Merkin sale of Sept. 11, 1974, lot 263).

The early obverse die state reveals an unbroken die, and a sharp one. Gradually, a crack begins before the 4th star and ~~to the~~ extends ~~into~~ into the 4th, 5th and 6th stars successively. Around the same time, a crack develops at the top of the head. In the late state, these cracks have become heavier. By now, stripes are noticeably weaker. In its terminal state, the rim has broken at two places: ~~at~~ at the point of the bust and below the O of the date.

The reverse die states are harder to describe because the die remains unbroken. A small rust pit develops following the final A of AMERICA, near the lower serif. This helps identify the later die state. As stated earlier, it has been suggested that the late state of these dies shows a repolishing ~~of the dies~~ leaving the borders weak.

1810 G-1, CHA-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) T. CLENEAY 1959 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890), T.L. ELDER 403 (Sept. 18, 1913); (2) R.W. WINSOR 1031 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (3) C. MORRIS 901 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1905); (4) H.P. SMITH DUP. 593 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1142 (1967) MS 60; (5) D.S. WILSON 1008 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (6) MAJ. R.L. LAMBERT 702 (S.H CHAPMAN, 1910); (7) P. MOUGEY 306 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (8) T.L. ELDER (June 5, 1911); (9) W.H. WOODIN 800d (T.L. ELDER, 1911); (10) G.H. EARLE, JR. 3638 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (11) G.H. EARLE, JR. 3639, a second sample (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (12) G.H. PARSONS 1969 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914), H. RYDER 302 (NN 44th, 1954) MS 60; (13) DR. G.P. FRENCH 376 (Dec. 5, 1917); (14) A.W. JACKMAN 878 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (15) W. SLEICHER 1203 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (16) J.S. JENKS 6262 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (17) T.L. ELDER 2325 (May, 1923); (18) F.R. ALVORD 147 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (19) ANDERSON GAL. 61 (April 3, 1926); (20) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 520 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (21) S.H. CHAPMAN 2065 (T.L. ELDER, 1929); (22) GEN. W.C. McCAW 2148 (T.L. ELDER, Nov. 22, 1930); (23) B. BLUESTONE 1628 (April 29, 1943); (24) B. E. ROACH 3276 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (25) B. BLUESTONE 373 (Feb., 1946); (26) B.M. MEHL 33 (114th Sale, 1951); (27) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1103 (STACK'S, 1954) ex V. BRAND; (28) DAVIS-GRAVES 102 (STACK'S, 1954); (29) 1955 MANA Conv. Sale 38 (Assoc. Coin Aucts.) MS 60; (30) T.J. CLARKE 458 (A. KOSOFF, 1956), J.D. SWEYD 90 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (31) PELLETREAU Cold. 15 (STACK'S, 1959); (32) M.A. HOLMES 1312 (STACK'S, 1960); (33) R.E. COX, JR. 205 (STACK'S, 1962); (34) L.G. LAHRMAN 107 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60, ex DR. FRENCH and T.J. CLARKE, sales not specified, perhaps those two referred to, above; (35) J. BROBSTON

(STACK'S, 1963), HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 130 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968); (36) C.R. BARTLETT 102 (STACK'S, 1966); (37) L. MERKIN 119 (March, 1967); (38) L. MERKIN 87 (June, 1968); (39) L. MERKIN 71 (Sept., 1968); (40) L. MERKIN 618 (March, 1969); (41) R.L. Miles, p. 32 (STACK'S, 1969); (42) W.R.T. SMITH, FPL May, 1973; (43) 1973 ANA Conv. Sale (Jess Peters); (44) 1974 ANA Conv. Sale (PARAMOUNT).

The Zerbe Warren catalogue for his September, 1968 sale said that less than a dozen uncirculated examples of this variety are "traced." ~~The~~ Paramount's 1974 ANA Convention sale catalogue said that no more than 10 or 12 are "fully weak state."

This coin is extraordinary weak on the right, obverse and reverse. On some uncirculated examples, the stars on the right are completely flat. Even with very strong impressions, where all the stars on the right are raised, a number of them ~~stars~~ will not show their centers. In none of the catalogue sales that I have recorded does any cataloguer regard that all stars on the right are centered.

The heel defect across thread and hair, first seen in the 1809 varieties, was incorrectly called a break in some of the Thomas L. Elder catalogues. Most of the catalogues have ignored die breaks, altogether.

The early state of the obverse die is perfect, but the stars on the right, though raised, will not all show their centers. The bottom of O in the date shows double cutting, as Comm. W.C. Eaton ~~[illegible]~~ observed. Next, a crack develops in the die from the top of the hair, then curves to the left, and "connects the three nearest stars" in the words of David Proskey. In addition, another crack extends across

the bar from ribbon to jaw terminating in a period. Which crack appears first is not made clear by the catalogues. Nor do the catalogues lend any support to Silbert's finding of an edge defect below the 1 of the date through the first six seven stars. It appears, also, that during the late state of this die, clash marks appear before the face and perhaps some rusting below the ~~ribbon~~ bust. Late state strikes are extremely flat on the right side.

The early reverse die state is perfect, but the right side, near AMERICA, is weak, and grows weaker with continued use of the die. The Zabriskie coin shows a light break connecting MER. This would represent the late state of the die, since the obverse also shows incrustation ~~marks~~ marks. The Ruby catalogue, Part I, mentions reverse die breaks but does not ~~specify~~ identify them. The catalogues have not mentioned the break ~~mentioned~~ reported by Silbert, namely, from T in UNITED to the final S in STATES.

1811 G-1, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.C. MILLER 1051 (T.L. ELDER, 1917); (2) G.H. HALL 129 (STACK'S, 1945); (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), R.L. MILES, JR. 33 (STACK'S, 1969); (4) PARAMOUNT RARE COIN LIST NO. 6 (Nov., 1973).

AU grades: (5) MILLION DOLLAR AUCT. 14 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (6) G. PIERCE 19 (STACK'S, 1965); (7) R.F. BATCHELDER, Coin World, Jan. 2, 1974, page 38) AU55.

EF grades: (8) H.P. SMITH DUP. 594 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1143 (1967) EF45, cleaned; (9) C.S. BEMENT 426 (H. CHAPMAN, 1916); (10) DR. G.P. FRENCH 377 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 5, 1917); (11) U.S. COIN CO. 502 (Feb. 6, 1918); (12) J.S. JENKS 6263 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (13) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2149 (T.L. ELDER, Nov. 22, 1930); (14) B. BLUESTONE 1629 (April 29, 1943); (15) NN 48th Sale 377 (1956) EF45, unpaired; (16) NN 54th Sale 1629 (1960) cleaned; (17) L. MERKIN 120 (March, 1967) cleaned; (18) L. MERKIN 88 (June, 1968); (19) L. MERKIN 72 (Sept., 1968); (20) J.C. RAWLS 1131 (STACK'S, 1970); (21) NN 51st Sale 118 (1970) EF40; (22) 1973 FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. Sale 1072 (RARCOA).

For some reason, obverse flaps are encountered more often than one might expect. The obverse impression is usually sharper than the reverse; ~~and the left side of the reverse is usually noticeably weaker than the right~~ and the left side of the reverse is often weak (L. MERKIN, Sept. 1968; NN 61, 1970). The uneven reverse is sometimes attributed to warping (Rarcoa's 1973 Florida United Num. Conv. Sale).

The early obverse die state shows a perfect die. Later states have clash marks behind the head (NN 59th Sale 1143 and 61st Sale 118; Merkin Sale of Sept. 1968).

The early reverse die state is the same as the later state G-2 at where at, presumably, worked die caused weakness on the left side. The weakness is ~~not so bad as~~ less pronounced than on a late state G-2, because the G-1 obverse does not have the advanced pre-star ~~[illegible]~~ rim break that takes away ~~top~~ additional metal from the reverse. The later state of the reverse die shows a light crack from the rim to the top of F in OF, and extending to the top of the O. Also, Roger S. Cohen, Jr. informs me that he has seen a crack from the left end of the bash to the leaf below the C. Uneven strikings of this variety are fairly common, making it more difficult to judge die states. A number of such uneven strikes produced coins that are weak on the right ~~as~~ side.

1811 G-2, CAM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) J.J. MICKLEY 2097 (LEAVITT, STREBEIGH, Oct., 1867), T. CLENEAY 1961 (CHAPMAN BROS., Dec 1890), T.L. ELDER 404 (Sept., 1913), H. RYDER (NN 44th Sale, 1954), then called a "specimen impression" and said to be also ~~[illegible]~~ ex J.B. CLEMENS, but I cannot find it in BANGS & Co., JAMES B. CLEMENS Sale of Oct., 1878; (2) T. WARNER 3125 (BANGS & Co., 1884, catalogued by the Chapmans), A.W. JACKMAN 879 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918) called "semi-proof," ~~[illegible]~~ unattributed as G-1, and said to have been discovered in 1884 when brought to B.H. COLLINS "by an old colored woman" who sold it to the Chapmans, who later sold it in the Warner Sale to Jackman; (3) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), called proof and identical to the HILLYER RYDER coin.

AU grades: (4) L. MERKIN 74 (Sept., 1968), the finest known with four-star die break; (5) N. SMITH 58 (STACK'S, 1973), notarized by a "master craftsman" (it says).

EF grades: (6) R.B. WINSOR 1032 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (7) R. HEWITT and B.C. BARTLETT 1174 (T.L. ELDER, 1918); (8) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2151 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (9) J.C. MORGENTHAU & Co. 516 (278th Sale, 1932); (10) B. BLUESTONE 1630 (April, 1943); (11) NN 56th Sale 445 (1962) EF 40; (12) J. BROBSTON, this example with four-star break (STACK'S, 1963); (13) 1966 GRAND CENTRAL COIN CONV. Sale 76 (PARAMOUNT); (14) L. MERKIN 73 (Sept., 1968).

The WARNER catalogue refers to another mint state 1811, sold in the CHARLES JAMES STEDMAN Sale conducted by BANGS & Co. in 1882 and catalogued by HARLAN P. SMITH under lot 752. But the STEDMAN catalogue had no plate for this coin and the description given was insufficient to attribute it.

The Merkin Sept., 1968 catalogue says that doubtful mint state specimens have been traced, two being in institutional collections.

The early obverse die state exhibits a perfect die. Early strikes even show striations from die polishing (NN 56th Sale, 1962). The late state has the four-star die break on the left. It would be convenient to classify the two-star break as the intermediate state, except for the fact that so few are known. Apparently, the die break immediately involved two stars (and did not become enlarged from a one-star break). This die state lasted ~~very~~ only briefly, before the break widened to involve four stars. ~~The catalogues do not describe any three-star~~ just as no one-star break is alleged to exist, so too, no catalogue describes a three-star break.

The early reverse die state is ~~the~~ perfect. Impressions are even, so no warping of the die is present, as yet. In the intermediate state, a noticeable ~~of~~ weakness appears on the left side of the reverse, involving the lettering, which has been attributed to warping of the die. The weakness is seen before the obverse die break occurs. After the massive four-star break, the late state of the ~~of~~ reverse die shows even greater weakness, especially at TED ST, caused by the flow of metal away from that area, and into the area of the break (NN 57th Sale, 1963 and Tester Harbourne Sale, 1968 Sale).

1825 G-1, CHM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) U.S. COIN CO. 120 (June 20, 1917), H. RYDER 304 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) MS 60; (2) DR. G.P. FRENCH 379 (Dec. 5, 1917); (3) A.W. JACKMAN 880 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (4) W. SLEICHER 1208 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (5) J.H. MANNING 30 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (6) J. TEN EYCK 1010 (B. MAX MEHL, 1922); (7) F.R. ALVORD 154 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (8) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 524 (T.L. ELDER, 1927); (9) GEN. W.C. McCAW 2152 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (10) T.L. ELDER 2891 (Jan. 1936); (11) T.L. ELDER 2551 (Jan. 1937); (12) T.L. ELDER 2117 (Jan. 1936); (13) S.H. McVITTY 30 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (14) B. BLUESTONE 1632 (April 29, 1943); (15) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 371 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (16) W.W. NEIL 2251 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (17) B.M. MEHL 36 (114th Sale, 1951); (18) J. PAWLING 106 (NN 39th Sale, 1952); (19) F. BALDENHOFER 102 (STACK'S, 1955); (20) M.A. HOLMES 1314 (STACK'S, 1960); (21) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), a one-sided proof; (22) MILLION DOLLAR AUCT. 15 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (23) W. VAN RODEN 137 (STACK'S, 1968); (24) HELFENSTEIN – JUDD 132 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968); (25) L. MERKIN 75 (Sept., 1968); (26) R.L. MILES, JR. 35 (STACK'S, 1969); (27) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 798 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (28) TERRELL Coll. 109 (AM. AUCT. ASSN, 1973) (28) A.R. TURINI 240 (STACK'S, 1972)

Lester Merkin's Sept., 1968 catalogue said that this variety is not known to exist in full brilliance. Harmer, Rooke's catalogue for its 1969 Million Dollar Sale said "but a single grade 65 coin known to exist."

The obverse die in its early state is unbroken and always shows a recut 12th star (on the right). The late state of this die shows that the 12th star developed a break to a dentil. Gilbert ~~probably~~ erroneously said the break was from the 2nd star on the left, instead of on the right. The cataloguers' notes do not support Gilbert's finding of a bisecting crack from left to right passing through the hair.

The early state of the reverse die is the same as the late state of the G-2 reverse, that is, it shows a recutting of all the letters of HALF CENT, except C. As the die is further used, clash marks are seen through the unused berry, extending from the leaf on the left to the leaf on the right.

1825 G-2, CAM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) F.R. ALVORD 157 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (2) T.L. ELDER 2162 (April 11, 1925); (3) Gen. W.C. McCAW 2152 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (4) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1389 (NUM. GAL.); (5) B.M. MEHL 37 (114th Sale, 1951); (6) KREISBERG + SCHULMAN 864 (Sale, 1960); (7) L.G. LAHRMAN 112 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60.

AU grades: (8) T.L. ELDER 2892 (Jan., 1936); (9) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1389 (NUM. GAL.)

EF grades: (10) R. HEWITT and B.C. BARTLETT 1175 (T.L. ELDER, 1918); (11) S.H. McVITTY 31 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (12) B. BLUESTONE 1633 (April 29, 1943); (13) C.M. WILLIAMS 734 (NUM. GAL., 1950) EF 40; (14) NN 56th Sale 447 (1962) 40 over 45; (15) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (16) L. MERKIN 121 (March, 1967); (17) W. VAN RODEN 138 (STACK'S, 1968) cleaned; (18) A.R. TURINI 242 (STACK'S, 1972), cleaned and recolored.

The cataloguer for NN 56th Sale (1962) gives the condition census as 60-60-50-40-40-35. The nearly bisecting vertical obverse die break is rare. In the Zoltenman catalogue (1963), it was said that four or five were known.

The early obverse die state ~~[illegible]~~ shows a perfect die. At some time during its use, the stars on the left start to weaken, and a rusting around RT develops (Merkin Sale of March, 1967). This might be considered the intermediate state. The final state of the die shows a vertical, nearly bisecting break from the rim above the head, down through the head, ending at the lowest curl. In addition, the 1st,

2nd, 5th and 6th stars on the left have been recut to strengthen them (NN 56th Sale, 1962, lot 448; ~~[illegible]~~ Zahrman; and Elder's Sale of April 11, 1925)

The reverse die state does not appear to change during its use in this mating, except that at the very end all the letters of HALF CENT, except C, are recut.

1826 G-1, CMM-1

UNCIRCULATED GRADES: (1) DR. G.P. FRENCH 380 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (2) DR. G.P. FRENCH 381 (U.S. COIN CO., 1917); (3) A.W. JACKMAN 881 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (4) W. SLEICHER 1209 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (5) J.H. MANNING 31 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (6) F.R. ALVORD 161 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) GEN. W. D. McCAW 2153 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (8) W. B. HALE 289 (B.M. MEHL, Nov. 28, 1939); (9) T.L. ELDER 2118 (JAN., 1936); (10) T.L. ELDER 2893 (JAN., 1936); (11) T.L. ELDER 894 (JAN., 1937); (12) T.L. ELDER 2551 (JAN., 1937); (13) B. BLUESTONE 1634 (April 29, 1943); (14) B.E. ROACH 3280 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (15) B. BLUESTONE 12 (86th Lib., 1945); (16) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 373 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (17) 1946 ANA CONV. Lib 1390 (NUM. GAL.); (18) W.W. NEIL 2254 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (19) B.M. MEHL 38 (114th Lib, 1951); (20) DAVIS-GRAVES 106 (STACK'S, 1954); (21) 1955 MANA CONV. Sale 40 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (22) M.A. HOLMES 1316 (STACK'S, 1960); (23) M.A. HOLMES 1317 (STACK'S, 1960); (24) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (25) S.W. WOLFSON 18 (STACK'S, 1963); (26) L. MERKIN 122 (March, 1967); (27) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 134 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968); (28) W. VAN RODEN 139 (STACK'S, 1968); (29) R.L. MILES, JR. 36 (STACK'S, 1969); (30) MILLION DOLLAR ~~SALE~~ SALE 799 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (31) 1971 ANA CONV. Lib 511 (STACK'S); (32) G.V. NELSON 15 (STACK'S, Feb. 5, 1971); (33) F.H. MASTERS, JR. 13 (RARCOA, 1971); (34) R. MARKS 121 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN, 1972); (35) DURHAM SALE 81 (SUPERIOR, 1973); (36) TERRELL SALE 10 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (37) 1973 FLA. UNITED NUM. CONV. Lib 1075 (RARCOA); (38) STACK'S 1059 (Jan.-Feb. 1974); (39) DR. C.L. RUBY 273 (SUPERIOR, PART I, Feb., 1974).

Not only are mint state specimens common, but there are many especially sharp, proof-like examples. However, uneven strikes are also seen, where the reverse is weak, in places (Anderson-Dupont 1111, Stack's 1954; and NN 61st sale 119). The RUBY catalogue, Part I, mentions the existence of cross-cross scratches not only to the right of the date, but also over the head. The fading of these scratches is one indication of the ~~the~~ die state.

The early obverse die state shows sharp cross-cross scratches and a perfect die. As the die is used, a crack appears from the point of the bust through the 1st, 2nd and 3rd stars on the left. Next, a crack is seen from L of LIBERTY to the head. In the late state, the last mentioned crack has reached the rim over L. The break through the stars has reached the 4th star on the left. A bisecting break has appeared from the bridge of the nose, through the lower locks to the rim below the 13th star. Also, there is a break from the border left of the 8th star, through the back hair to Y of LIBERTY.

The early reverse state shows a perfect die, with the letters E, R and C of AMERICA always recut. The intermediate state shows the start of a break from the left ribbon end to U of UNITED. There also seems to be a rust pit on the left, and to the bottom, of the first S in STATES. In the late state, the break from the left ribbon end is ~~[illegible]~~ more pronounced.

1826 G-2, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) W. SLEICHER 1211 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (2) F.R. ALVORD 162 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (3) T.L. ELDER 1986 (April, 1928); (4) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2154 (T.L. ELDER, 1930); (5) B. BLUESTONE 1635 (April 29, 1943); (6) B. BLUESTONE 13 (86th Sale, 1945); (7) G.O. WALTON 68 (STACK'S, 1963); (8) A.R. TURINI 246 (STACK'S, 1972).

AU grades: (9) W.W. NEIL 2255 (B.M. MEHL, 1947).

EF grades: (10) W.B. GUY 941 (H. CHAPMAN, 1911) two-star break, and pencil notation "Ryder" in ANS copy of this catalogue; (11) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1112 (STACK'S, 1954) EF40; (12) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1969); (13) L. MERKIN 76 (Sept., 1968).

VF grades: (14) W.B. HALE 290 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (15) NN 56th Sale 449 (1962) VF20; (16) J. BROBSTON, second specimen with two-star break (STACK'S, 1963); (17) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 135 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968); (18) DR. C.L. RUBY 274 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

Sellal suggests that the reverse of this variety was first used to strike 1828 G-2. If this is so, the 1826 G-2 die state should begin where 1828 G-2 ended, that is, with a crack connecting E of KENT and A of HALF. Unfortunately, the catalogueers have shed no light on this. My own observation of a number of reverses of 1826 G-2 fails to show that break, ~~shows only the barely beginning of a crack from the top of the E,~~ which would seem to ~~show~~ indicate that the reverse die was first used with the 1826 obverse. For the time being, therefore, I am reserving judgment about the reverse die states for this variety.

The obverse die states are fairly clear. The early state shows a perfect die. The bottom of the 6 on the lower right side

seems recut, and the 13th star is repunched. At the end of its life, the die breaks out at the rim, and involves the 4th and 5th stars (W.B. GUY and the BROBSTON VF). The die was retired immediately after that break.

The ALVORD coin was said to be sharply struck, the ANDERSON-DUPONT not well struck up on the reverse, and the HELFENSTEIN-JUDD unevenly struck. The RUBY catalogue says a "blunt" strike is used.

At the NN 56th Sale (1962) catalogue said that a VF 30 figures in the condition census.

1828 G-1, CAM-3

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.P. SMITH DUP. Sale 595 (CHAPMAN BROS., June, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1149 (1967); (2) P. MOUGEY 311 (T.L. ELDER, 1910), W.B. HALE 291 (B.M. MEHL, 1939); (3) W. SLEICHER 1212 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (4) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 460 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (5) J.S. JENKS 6266 (H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (6), (7) and (8) F.R. ALVORD 163, 164 and 165 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (9) DR. D.W. VALENTINE 533 (T.L. Elder, Dec. 8, 1927) erroneously reporting a die break from hair to 1st star, appearing again as H. RYDER 306 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) MS 60-65; (10), (11) and (12) C. BUCHHOLTZ 1687, 1688 and 1689 (T.L. Elder, April, 1928); (13) T.L. Elder 1988 (April, 1928); (14) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2155 (T.L. Elder, Nov. 22, 1930); (15), (16) and (17) T.L. Elder 2894, 2894a and 2119 (Jan., 1936); (18) and (19) T.L. Elder 57 and 895 (Jan., 1937); (20) M.H. BOLENDER 258 (Nov. 21, 1938); (21) B. BLUESTONE 1636 (April, 1943); (22) B. BLUESTONE 14 (Feb., 1945); (23) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 375 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (24) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1392 (NUM. GAL.); (25) W.W. NEIC 2256 (B.M. MEHL, 1947); (26) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1113 (STACK'S, 1954) MS 60; (27) NN 48th Sale 378 (1956) MS 70; (28) NN 51st Sale 1203 (1958); (29) NN 52nd Sale 98 (1958); (30) P.G. STRAUS 91 (STACK'S, 1959); (31) J.D. SWEYD 93 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (32) L.G. LAHRMAN 114 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (33) and (34) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (35) G.O. WALTON 69 (STACK'S, 1963); (36) S.W. WOLFSON 79 (STACK'S, 1963); (37) L. MERKIN 123 (March, 1967); (38) NN-MBS Sept. 26, 1967, lot 14; (39) C. JAY 84 (STACK'S, 1967); (40) W. VAN RODEN 141 (STACK'S, 1968); (41) L. MERKIN 136 (March, 1968); (42) L. MERKIN 90 (June, 1968); (43)

R.T. DAVIS 5 (STACK'S, 1968); (44) L. MERKIN 77 (Sept., 1968); (45) R.L. MILES, JR. 37 (STACK'S, 1969); (46) L. MERKIN 12 (Sept., 1970); (47) G.V. NELSON 16 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971); (48) A. MARK Catalogue, Dec., 1972; (49) N. SMITH 61 (March, 1973); (50) GILHOUSEN Sale 6 (SUPERIOR, Part III, 1973); (51) W.R.T. SMITH FPL May, 1973, MS 60; (52) TERRELL Coll. 111 (AM. AUCT. ASSN, 1973); (53) QUALITY SALES 960 (Sept., 1973) MS 60; (54) WESTCHESTER Sale 4 (STACK'S, 1973); (55) 1973 FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. Sale 1081 (Rarcoa) MS 65; (56) DR. C.L. RUBY 277 (SUPERIOR, Part I, 1974); (57) STACK'S 12 (June, 1974); (58) L. MERKIN 266 (Sept., 1974)

The cataloguers emphasize the brilliance, sharpness and proof-like quality of their offerings; and they like to refer frequently to the Collins hoard and the spotty wire state coins found therein. Less ecstatic ~~descriptions~~ findings include an "obverse somewhat weakly struck at left" (NN 56th Sale 450, AU), a "softly struck" MS65 (Rarcoa's 1973 Fla. Unitry Num Convention, lot 1081), and a "reverse lightly struck around the rims" (F.H. Masters p. 14, Rarcoa, May, 1971, EF).

The reverse of ALVORD 164 was "slightly doubled struck". The cataloguers have not supplied any die state information. Aside from the letter U in UNITED, which always appears double cut, other letters ~~(STOCKING HALF CENT)~~ were recut from time to time, but this is not discussed.

1828 G-2, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) D.S. WILSON 1012 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1907); (2) A.W. JACKMAN 882 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (3) F.R. ALVORD 166 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924) two coins; (4) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2155 (T.L. ELDER, Nov., 1930); (5) T.L. ELDER 2895 (Jan., 1936); (6) T.L. ELDER 896 (Jan., 1937); (7) and (8) T.L. ELDER 2045a and 2321 (June, 1937); (9) B. BLUESTONE 1637 (April, 1943); (10) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1394 (NUM. GAL.) & DR. G.P. FRENCH, sale and lot number not identified; (11) C.M. WILLIAMS 738 (NUM. GAL., 1950) MS 70; (12) B.M. MEHL 40 (114th Sale, 1951); (13) DAVIS-GRAVES 108 (STACK'S, 1954); (14) 1955 MANA CONV. Sale 41 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (15) FED. COIN EXCH. 967 (Nov., 1956); (16) and (17) M.A. HOLMES 1318 and 1319 (STACK'S, 1960); (18) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (19) S.W. WOLFSON 20 (STACK'S, 1963); (20) STACK'S 16 (March, 1968); (21) RARCOA 34 (May, 1969); (22) WINTER COLL. 1060 (STACK'S, Jan.-Feb., 1974).

AU grades: (23) R.B. LEEDS 1027 (H. CHAPMAN, 1906) as unc., NN 59th Sale 1148 (1967) AU55; (24) A.R. TURINI 248 (STACK'S, 1972); (25) DR. C.L. RUBY 275 (SUPERIOR, Part I, 1974), "from England."

EF grades: (26) J. BROBSTON, a second specimen (STACK'S, 1963), HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 137 (L. MERKIN, March, 1968) & E. GILBERT as well as J. BROBSTON, EF plus.

VF grades: (27) DR. C.L. RUBY 276, a second specimen (SUPERIOR, Part I, 1974) & S.M. KOEPPEL, March 17, 1943.

Most of the mint state coins are described as some shade of brown. The NN 59th Sale (1967) catalogue said that only two choice red specimens were known, one of them (MS 70) being in the Breen

collection. It also said that an AU55 was in the condition census.

The obverse early die state discloses a perfect die. The stars are sharp (Alvord). At some point during its use, the 2nd star on the left is recut (Comm. W.C. Eaton, The Numismatist, Nov., 1921, page 520).

The reverse early state also shows a perfect die (Ruby 275), although the "spines" are present. After a while, clash marks appear and a faint crack joins the A of HALF to the C of CENT. At some point, the die is reground removing the clash marks and part of the spines (Ruby 276 and Halperstein-Judd). The shorter spines, therefore, show a later state of the die, not an earlier one.

1828 G-3, CHM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) REV. J.M. FINOTTI Coll., the ~~property~~ property of W. ELLIOT WOODWARD 947 (BANGS, MERWIN, 1862); (2) W. ELLIOT WOODWARD 2101 (J.J. MICKLEY, 1867); (3) T. CLENEAY 1965 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1890); (4) R.B. WINSOR 1036 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (5) W. CARR 498 (E.S. SEARS (Oct., 1909); (6) P. MOUGEY 310 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (7) and (8) W.H. WOODIN 800; and 801 (T.L. ELDER, March, 1911); (9) T.L. ELDER 688 (June, 1911); (10) G.H. EARLE 3646 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (11) M.N. JACKSON 1419 (U.S. COIN, May, 1913); (12) G.M. PARSONS 1973 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (13) U.S. COIN Co. 123 (June, 1917); (14) DR. G.P. FRENCH 383 (U.S. COIN, Dec. 1917); (15) A.W. JACKMAN 883 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (16) J.H. MANNING 33 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (17) T.L. ELDER 2328 (May, 1923); (18) F.R. ALVORD 167 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (19) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2155 (T.L. ELDER, Nov. 1930); (20) and (21) T.L. ELDER 2120 and 2896 (Jan., 1936); (22) T.L. ELDER 897 (Jan., 1937); (23) G.E. CHATILLON 1667 (B.M. MEHL, 1938); (24) B. BLUESTONE 1638 (April, 1943); (25) B.E. ROACH 3281 (B.M. MEHL, 1944); (26) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1395 (NUM. GAL.) ex Dr. G.P. FRENCH, it not being specified whether the Sale of December, 1917 ("14" above) is referred to, or one of three other FRENCH half cent auctions, or a private sale; (27) B.M. MEHL 39 (114th Sale, 1951); (28) H. RYDER 307 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) ex stock of W. RAYMOND, MS 60; (29) S.W. FREEMAN 1071 (KREISBERG & SCHULMAN, May, 1958) misattributed as G-1; (30) P.G. STRAUS 90 (STACK'S, 1959); (31) M.A. HOLMES 1320 (STACK'S, 1960); (32) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 867 (Feb., 1960); (33) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S,

1963), C. JAY 85 (STACK'S, 1967); (34) S.W. WOLFSON 21 (STACK'S, 1963); (35) J.D. SWEYD 95 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (36) L. MERKIN 124 (March, 1967); (37) R.T. DAVIS 6 (STACK'S, 1968); (38) W. VAN RODEN 143 (STACK'S, 1968); (39) L. MERKIN 138 (March, 1968); (40) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 800 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969); (41) L. MERKIN 623 (March, 1969) borderline unc.; (42) ALTO Coll. 525 (STACK'S, 1970); (43) G.V. NELSON 17 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971); (44) A.R. TURINI 250 (STACK'S, 1972); (45) MAYFLOWER COIN AUCT. 42 (JUNE, 1972); (46) A. CHAMPA 593 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1972); (47) BOWERS & RUDDY, RARE COIN LIST No. 18 (1973); (48) W.R.T. SMITH, FPL, May 1973, MS 60; (49) L. MERKIN 267 (Sept., 1974).

The Harmer, Rooke "Million Dollar Sale" catalogue (1969) said that only one MS 65 specimen was known. In 1967, the NN 59th Sale catalogue said the only two full mint state coins were known, and say AU's.

Ordinarily, the stars on the left are a little weak (BROBSTON-JAY, R.T. DAVIS, and RARCOA, May, 1969). ~~The~~ ~~additional~~ Parts of the curls are also weak (L. MERKIN, Sept. 1974 and GILHOUSEN, Oct., 1973). The reverse usually shows weak leaves under TA (Merkin, Sept. 1974).

The early obverse die state is perfect. Gradually, a break develops from the 2nd star to the top of the ribbon (Ruby; Merkin Sept., 1970; and Merkin, March, 1967). At some point, the 3rd star is recut.

The early reverse die state is perfect. After use, a crack

is seen from above the sun is diagonally through I of UNITED, to the wreath. Various letters of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are recut, from time to time, to strengthen them.

1829 G-1, CMA-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) R.B. WINSOR 1039 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1895); (2) and (3) P. MOUGEY 312 and 313 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (4) W.H. WOODIN 802 (T.L. ELDER, 1911); (5) and (6) G.H. EARLE, JR. 3649 and 3650 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (7) T.L. ELDER 407 (Sept., 1913), H. RYDER 308 (NN 44th Sale, 1954) MS 65; (8) G.W. PARSONS 1975 (H. CHAPMAN, 1914); (9) DR. G.P. FRENCH 384 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec., 1917); (10) A.W. JACKMAN 884 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (11) W. SLEICHER 1215 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1919); (12) F.R. KIMBALL 1012 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (13) T.L. ELDER 2330 (May, 1923); (14) and (15) F.R. ALVORD 168 and 169 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (16) T.L. ELDER 1989 (April, 1928); (17) GEN. W.D. McCAW 2156 (T.L. ELDER, Nov., 1930); (18) T.L. ELDER 2897 (Jan., 1936); (19) and (20) T.L. ELDER 1347a and 2903 (Jan., 1937); (21) T.L. ELDER 2046 (June, 1937); (22) S.H. McVITTY 35 (B.M. MEHL, March, 1938); (23) B. BLUESTONE 1639 (April, 1943); (24) B. BLUESTONE 15 (86th Sale, 1945); (25) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 377 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (26) C.M. WILLIAMS 740 (NUM. GAL., 1950) MS 65; (27) B.M. MEHL 41 (114th Sale, 1951); (28) 1953 MANA CONV. Sale (ROGER COHEN, JR) 273 (NN 42nd Sale) "just about" MS 70; (29) 1955 MANA CONV. Sale 43 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (30) P.G. STRAUS 92 (STACK'S, 1959); (31) M.A. HOLMES 1321 (STACK'S, 1960); (32) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (33) S.W. WOLFSON 22 (STACK'S, 1963); (34) J.D. SWEYD 96 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 65; (35) 1966 GRAND CENTRAL CONV. SALE (PARAMOUNT); (36) NN 59th Sale 1155 (1967) MS 60; (37) W. VAN RODEN 144 (STACK'S, 1968); (38) L. MERKIN 79 (SEPT., 1968); (39) R.L. MILES, JR. 39 (STACK'S, 1969); (40) G.V. NELSON 18 (STACK'S, FEB., 1971); (41) A.R. TURINI

251 (STACK'S, 1972); (42) A-MARK GROUP CATALOGUE, DEC., 1972, MS 60; (43) TERRELL COLL. 113 (AMER. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (44) N. SMITH 63 (STACK'S, 1973); (45) G.F. SCANLON 21 (STACK'S, 1973); (46) WESTCHESTER SALE 7 (STACK'S, 1973); (47) DR. C.L RUBY 279 (SUPERIOR, Part I, 1974); (48) WINTER COLL. 1062 (STACK'S, Jan.–Feb., 1974).

AU grades: (49) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1116 (STACK'S, 1954) AU55, ex V. BRAND, the GILBERT plate coin; (50) H.M.F. SCHULMAN 1623 (Dec., 1966).

The obverse of the Brabston coin shows the outer points of the stars on the right pulled outward, by striking pressures, to the border, as noted by Gilbert.

The early state of the reverse die is perfect. Later, a break is seen through C of CENT, which gradually extends upward (NN 56th Sale, 1962). In the late state, a faint crack is seen through the tops of OF and ME (Merkin, Sept. 1968). A repolishing of the die removed the fine work over ICA (Ruby 280, Superior, Feb. 1974) and probably blunted the leaves on the lower right. The crack through C has extended through H of HALF, through a berry, and terminated above the outside edge of the highest leaf. The faint crack through OF ME is now seen through the tops of ATE, OF and AME (Ruby 280).

1831 G-1, CMM-1 (the trade coin, not the proof)

I have a record of seven sales: (1) A.W. JACKMAN 886 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918), graded F. (2) H. CHAPMAN 1818 (July, 1922), graded VF. (3) T.L. ELDER 2732 (June, 1932), "nearly fine." (4) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1118 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 30. (5) NN 51st Sale 1205 (1958), graded MS. (6) L. MERKIN 126 (March, 1967) "possibly ex Farouk," graded VF and the equal of Anderson-Dupont. (7) HELFENSTEIN-JUDD 140 (L. MERKIN March 1968) EF 45 to AU 50.

The catalogues do not discuss die states; and not enough may have been struck to distinguish between early and late states, although the reverse, used again to strike 1832 G-2, may show differences from its 1832 strikings.

The Merkin catalogue for March, 1967 says that only six examples in circulated condition are known. The specimen there offered weighed only 81.1 grains, instead of 84. The NN 51st Sale (1958) catalogue says that only three uncirculated specimens are known, the one there offered being brought at the mint. Walter Breen wrote that "there is an uncirculated example in the Mint Collection which does not appear ever to have had proof surface (United States Half Cents, The Numismatist, Vol. 65 (May, 1952), page 461).

1832 G-1, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades: (1) DR. G.P. FRENCH 385 (U.S. COIN CO., Dx. 1917); (2) A.W. JACKMAN 888 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (3) F.R. ALVORD 173 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) COMM. W.C. EATON 542 (H. CHAPMAN, 1929); (5) T.L. ELDER 2898 (Jan., 1936); (6) S.H. McVITTY 36 (B.M. MEHL, 91st Sale, 1938); (7) W.B. HALE 296 (B.M. MEHL, 94th Sale, 1939); (8) B. BLUESTONE 1640 (April, 1943); (9) C.M. WILLIAMS 742 (NUM. GAL., 1950); (10) F. BALDENHOFER 109 (STACK'S, 1955); (11) 1955 MANA CONV. Sale 44 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (12) W. VAN RODEN 145 (STACK'S, 1968); (13) G.V. NELSON 19 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971); (14) 1973 FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. Sale 1083 (RARCOA) MS65.

AU grades: (15) M.A. HOLMES (STACK'S 1960); (16) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963)

EF grades (17) F.R. ALVORD 175, with varnish (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (18) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1120 (STACK'S, 1954) EF 45; (19) L. MERKIN (March, 1967) rev. cleaned; (20) L. MERKIN 141 (March, 1968) EF-AU.

Not offered as frequently as one might suppose in mint state. Some of the catalogues said that fully mint red specimens were known, although examples with some faded mint color are not rare.

There is no discussion of obverse die states. The early reverse die state is unbroken (Alvord 173). The terminal state shows a break from the rim between T and E of STATES to the wreath (Alvord 175). This must have happened at the very end, because the break is rare (Foster Merkin catalogue, March, 1967)

(141)
and 142

1832 G-2, CMM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) DR. G.P. FRENCH 386 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 1917); (2) J. H. MANNING 37 (B.M. MEHL, 1921); (3) F.R. ALVORD 177 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) W.B. HALE 297 (B.M. MEHL, 94th Sale, 1939); (5) B. BLUESTONE 1642 (April, 1943); (6) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 381 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (7) DAVIS-GRAVES 111 (STACK'S, 1954); (8) FED. COIN EXCH. 968 (Nov., 1956); (9) 1957 ANA CONV. SALE 57 (FED. COIN EXCH.); (10) KREISBERG and SCHULMAN 869 (1960); (11) A. KREISBERG 65 (MBS, Sept. 18, 1961); (12) MILLION DOLLAR AUCT. 19 (FED. BRAND, 1963); (13) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (14) S.W. WOLFSON 24 (STACK'S, 1963); (15) C. JAY 86 (STACK'S, 1967); (16) W. VAN RODEN 146 (STACK'S, 1968); (17) L. MERKIN 142 (March, 1968); (18) N. SMITH 64 (STACK'S, 1973); (19) TERRELL Coll. 114 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (20) WINTER Coll. 1063 (STACK'S, 1974).

AU grades: (21) H.P. SMITH DUP. 596 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906) graded unc, NN 59th Sale 1157 (1967) graded "close to" MS 60; (22) NN 56th Sale 454 (1962) AU55 (23) J. BROBSTON, a second example (STACK'S, 1963); (24) DR. C.L. RUBY 281 (SUPERIOR, PART I, 1974).

The obverse die shows no breaks. There is no discussion in the catalogues to distinguish between early and late states, except by reference to the reverse.

The reverse early state shows part of the engravers' arc line between S and O. It is prominent. In the late state, a faint rim break is seen to A of STATES. The arc line has faded considerably, but is still visible.

1832 G-3, CMM-3

Uncirculated grades: (1) U.S. COIN CO. 126 (June, 1917); (2) A.W. JACKMAN 890 (H. CHAPMAN, 1918); (3) W.B. HALE 298 (B.M. MEHL, 94th Sale, 1939); (4) B. BLUESTONE 1643 (April, 1943); (5) C.M. WILLIAMS 744 (NUM. GAL., 1950) MS 60; (6) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1396 (NUM. GAL.) of DR. G.P. FRENCH, the Sale not identified; (7) ANDERSON-DUPONT 1121 (STACK'S, 1954); (8) L.G. LAHRMAN 123 (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS 60; (9) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (10) L. MERKIN 143 (March, 1968); (11) W. VAN RODEN 147 (STACK'S, 1968); (12) G.V. NELSON 20 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971); (13) A.R. TURINI 254 (STACK'S, 1972); (14) L. MERKIN 518 (Oct., 1972).

VF grades: (15) F.R. ALVORD 179 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (16) ANDERSON-DUPONT, same specimen 1122 (STACK'S, 1954) VF 25; (17) NN 61st Sale 123 (June, 1970).

The obverse die remains unbroken after having been used here, as well as in G-1 and G-2. Possibly the re-cutting of the stars on the right may evidence the late state. The catalogues do not discuss this.

The reverse die also remains unbroken. The late state may be shown by the severely rusted reverse (Anderson-Dupont 1121 and 1122; and NN 51st Sale, 1958). It may also be shown by the recut D and ES (NN 51st Sale, 1958 and 61st Sale, 1970).

1833 G-1, CAM-1

Uncirculated grades: (1) H.P. SMITH DUP. 599 (CHAPMAN BROS., 1906), NN 59th Sale 1160 (1967) MS 65; (2) P. MOUGEY 318 (T.L. ELDER, 1910); (3) U.S. COIN CO. 128 (June, 1917); (4) DR. G.P. FRENCH 387 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 1917); (5) DR. J.M. HENDERSON 466 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1921); (6) F.R. ALVORD 182 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) T.L. ELDER 2904 (Jan. 1937); (8) T.L. ELDER 2322 (June 1937); (9) B. BLUESTONE 1643 (April, 1943); (10) 1946 ANA Conv. Sale 1398 (Num. Sol) ex Dr. G.P. FRENCH, Sale not identified, perhaps the Dr French Sale, above, conducted by U.S. Coin Co. on Dec. 5, 1917; (11) 1955 MANA Conv. Sale 45 (ASSOC. COIN AUCT.); (12) S.W. FREEMAN 1077 (KREISBERG & SCHULMAN, 1958); (13) and (14) M.A. HOLMES 1324 and 1328 (STACK'S, 1960); (15) NN 54th Sale 1631 (1960); (16) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 871 (Feb. 1960); (17) NN 56th Sale 455 (1960); (18) S.W. WOLFSON 25 (STACK'S, 1963); (19) 1966 GRAND CENTRAL COIN CONV. Sale 83 (PARAMOUNT); (20) C. MERKIN 92 (June, 1968); (21) W. VAN RODEN 149 (STACK'S, 1968); (22) L. MERKIN 80 (Sept., 1968); (23) L. MERKIN 14 (Sept., 1970); (24) HILLCREST ENTERPRISES 99 (Oct., 1970) MS 65; (25) 1971 ANA CONV. Sale 3 (STACK'S); (26) G.V. NELSON 21 (STACK'S, Feb. 1971); (27) A.R. TURINI 47 (STACK'S, 1972); (28) TERRELL Coll. 115 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1973); (29) N. SMITH 65 (STACK'S, 1973); (30) GILHOUSEN Sale 8 (SUPERIOR, PART III, Oct., 1973) lacquered; (31) 1973 FLA. ~~UNIT~~ UNIT. NUM. Conv. Sale 1086 (RARCOA); (32) WINTER Coll. 1064 (STACK'S, 1974); (33) STACK'S 234 (March, 1974); (34) AUSTIN Coll. 221 (AM. AUCT. ASSN., 1974); (35) PARAMOUNT RARE COIN LIST No. 8 (Aug. 1974); (36) L.F. KNIGHT,

Coin World, Aug. 14, 1974, page 14, on KENNETH LEE.
EF grades: (37) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (38), (39) and (40) DR. C.L. RUBY 282, 283 and 284 (SUPERIOR, Part I, 1974).

Because of the repolishing of the dies from time to time, to remove clash marks, an unusual number of proof-like examples are offered. This variety is commonly encountered in a quite presentable condition, but showing the clashes and cracked dies.

The early obverse die state is perfect. Very soon, clash marks appear and a long break in the left field connecting all stars, except the first (Ruby 282). Die repolishing removes earlier clash marks, but new ones appear, differently located (Ruby 283). Finally, still more clash marks are seen, namely, CA above the hood and more than two-thirds of the wreath (Ruby 284).

The early reverse die state is also perfect and without clash marks. However, incusation marks soon appear. These are polished off, but new ones are quickly seen. At one point, the outline of the hood is visible within the wreath (NN 56th sale, 1962). The catalogues have not co-ordinated the appearance of the reverse marks with the obverse marks.

1834 G-1, CoM-1

Uncirculated grades (Representative examples from among many offerings): (1) H.P. SMITH DUP. 599 (CHAPMAN BROS., June, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1162 (1967) MS 60; (2) G.H. EARLE, JR. 3659 (H. CHAPMAN, 1912); (3) DR. G.P. FRENCH 389 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec., 1917), possibly appearing again in the 1946 ANA Conv. Sale, below; (4) F.R. KIMBALL 1017 (T.L. ELDER, 1921); (5) and (6) F.R. ALVORD 184 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (7) and (8) T.L. ELDER 2121 and 2899 (Jan., 1936); (9) WORLD'S GREATEST COLL. 384 (NUM. GAL., 1945); (10) 1946 ANA CONV. Sale 1399 (NUM. GAL) & T.J. CLARKE and DR. G.P. FRENCH, Sales not identified, perhaps the Dr French Sale of Dec., 1917, above); (11) C.M. WILLIAMS 746 (NUM. GAL., 1950); (12), (13), (14) and (15) S.W. FREEMAN 1078, 1079, 1080 and 1081 (KREISBERG & SCHULMAN, 1958); (16) M.A. HOLMES 1330 (STACK'S, 1960); (17) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (18) L.G. LAHRMAN (A. KOSOFF, 1963) MS60; (19) NN 57th Sale 8 (1963); (20) G.O. WALTON 76 (STACK'S, 1963); (21) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 801 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) MS 65; (22) G.V. NELSON 22 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971).

There are no breaks reported by the catalogues. The later state of the dies shows incusation marks, both obverse and reverse. The NN 59th Sale catalogue (1967) says that this variety with original hub red is scarce than 1833.

1835 G-1, CMM-2

Uncirculated grades (Representative specimens from among many): (1) H.P. SMITH DUP. 599 (CHAPMAN BROS., June, 1906), NN 59th Sale 1166 (1967) MS 60, L. MERKIN 99 (June, 1972); (2) DR. G.P. FRENCH 390 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 1917), perhaps appearing again ~~[illegible]~~ as 1946 ANA Conv. Sale 1400 (NUM. GAL.) there described as ex Dr. French, but the Sale not identified; (3) F.R. ALVORD 186 (S.H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) T.L. ELDER 2900 (Jan., 1936); (5) T.J. CLARKE 468 (A. KOSOFF, 1956); (6) NN 51st Sale 1212 (1958); (7) KREISBERG & SCHULMAN 873 (Feb., 1960); (8) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963); (9) G.O. WALTON 77 (STACK'S, 1963); (10) L. MERKIN 147 (March, 1968); (11) L. MERKIN 94 (June, 1968); (12) 1973 FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. Sale 1088 (RARCOA) MS 65.

By description, it would seem that a number of specimens qualify for a grade of MS 70, although I do not find one so graded in the catalogues I have seen. Certainly, the condition census does not ~~[illegible]~~ have to go below 65. The low grade coins are rare, not the upper grades.

The early obverse state is perfect and, according to Comm. Eaton, the 5 is always found recut. Although clash marks appear soon, the reverse is still uncracked, at this stage (H.P. SMITH duplicate — NN 59th Sale). In the intermediate and late states, the obverse will also show clash ~~marks~~ marks, usually below the bust (unless worn away or polished away), but the reverse will show cracks.

The early reverse state is perfect. There are no clash marks, but they soon appear in the form of ~~partial~~ partial

outlines of the bust. The intermediate state shows two breaks: one, through ERICA into the field below the right ribbon; the other, from the border into R of AMERICA. In the last state, the cracks are more pronounced and the one through R has invaded the wreath. In addition, a large semi-circular break is now seen from the left border near D, through the wreath into HA, turning upward through the wreath again, and terminating at the upper border, right of O. At this point, use of the reverse die is discontinued. The catalogues do not lend support to Gilbert's statement that the reverse die is also broken from the border to C in AMERICA.

1835 G-2, CMA-1

Uncirculated grades (Representative specimens from among many): (1) DR. G. P. FRENCH 391 (U.S. COIN CO., Dec. 1917); (2) and (3) F. R. ALVORD 187 and 188 (S. H. CHAPMAN, 1924); (4) W. W. NEIL 2270 (B. M. MEHL, 1947); (5) C. M. WILLIAMS 750 (NUM. GAL., 1950) MS 65; (6) NN 51st Sale 1211 (1958); (7) NN 56th Sale 459 (1962) MS 65; (8) and (9) J. BROBSTON (STACK'S, 1963), two specimens; (10) NN 59th Sale 1165 (1967) MS 60; (11) L. MERKIN 148 (March, 1968); (12) MILLION DOLLAR SALE 802 (HARMER, ROOKE, 1969) MS 65; (13) NN 61st Sale 125 (1970); (14) 1971 CSNS (F. H. MASTERS) Sale 22 (RARCOA); (15) G. V NELSON 23 (STACK'S, Feb., 1971); (16) 1973 FLA. UNIT. NUM. CONV. Sale 1089 (RARCOA)

One of the Brobston coins is a one-sided proof. The "Million Dollar Sale" example may be, also, since the catalogue says that the obverse is "almost proof-like." Some weak strikes are encountered, such as NN 61st Sale ("weakly and unevenly struck"), NN 59th Sale ("lightly struck in the center of the obverse, as this date sometimes comes"), and Masters ("not fully struck up").

The early obverse die state is perfect, despite the fact that it had been used to strike the coins of 1833 and 1834. Perhaps it had been polished, again, before its 1835 use, to remove prior clash marks. Perhaps, also, the successive polishings have blunted the die, thereby producing the weak, and unevenly-struck specimens referred to above. With continued use of the die, incusation marks again appear (NN 61st Sale, 1970), below the bust and behind the hair, at the ribbons.

The early reverse die state is perfect. In its late state, clash marks have appeared. In addition, there is a break from the border to the second T in STATES (ALVORD 189). The second break ~~[illegible]~~ described by Gilbert (border, through first S in STATES, to wreath) is not mentioned by the cataloguers.

Alvord 190 is an inexplicable specimen. S.H. CHAPMAN's description is: "Very thin planchet. Wt. 42 grs. Unique."

MILTON B PFEFFER
750 KAPPOCK ST
BRONX NY 10463

Feb 2 - 1978

Dear Roger,

Thank you very much for your kind note of Jan. 28. You know how much I value your opinions, so you can imagine how pleased I was to read your comments! At bottom we are a bit that I have not been able to meet with you more often to talk about (½), but unfortunately the demands of a busy law practice insist on their priority.

Perhaps we'll be able to make contact again during some of the spring conventions. In the meantime, the best of luck to you, and keep up your good work. I enjoyed your current ~~on~~ report in P-W on nasty. and c c

Sincerely,

Milt